

University of Warwick institutional repository: <http://go.warwick.ac.uk/wrap>

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of PhD at the University of Warwick

<http://go.warwick.ac.uk/wrap/45734>

This thesis is made available online and is protected by original copyright.

Please scroll down to view the document itself.

Please refer to the repository record for this item for information to help you to cite it. Our policy information is available from the repository home page.

Library Declaration and Deposit Agreement

1. STUDENT DETAILS

Please complete the following:

Full name: Bethany Nelson

University ID number: 0657590

2. THESIS DEPOSIT

2.1 I understand that under my registration at the University, I am required to deposit my thesis with the University in BOTH hard copy and in digital format. The digital version should normally be saved as a single pdf file.

2.2 The hard copy will be housed in the University Library. The digital version will be deposited in the University's Institutional Repository (WRAP). Unless otherwise indicated (see 2.3 below) this will be made openly accessible on the Internet and will be supplied to the British Library to be made available online via its Electronic Theses Online Service (EThOS) service.

[At present, theses submitted for a Master's degree by Research (MA, MSc, LLM, MS or MMedSci) are not being deposited in WRAP and not being made available via EThOS. This may change in future.]

2.3 In exceptional circumstances, the Chair of the Board of Graduate Studies may grant permission for an embargo to be placed on public access to the hard copy thesis for a limited period. It is also possible to apply separately for an embargo on the digital version. (Further information is available in the *Guide to Examinations for Higher Degrees by Research*.)

2.4 *If you are depositing a thesis for a Master's degree by Research, please complete section (a) below. For all other research degrees, please complete both sections (a) and (b) below:*

(a) Hard Copy

I hereby deposit a hard copy of my thesis in the University Library to be made publicly available to readers immediately as agreed by the Chair of the Board of Graduate Studies.

I agree that my thesis may be photocopied.

YES

(b) Digital Copy

I hereby deposit a digital copy of my thesis to be held in WRAP and made available via EThOS.

Please choose one of the following options:

My thesis can be made publicly available online. YES

3. GRANTING OF NON-EXCLUSIVE RIGHTS

Whether I deposit my Work personally or through an assistant or other agent, I agree to the following:

Rights granted to the University of Warwick and the British Library and the user of the thesis through this agreement are non-exclusive. I retain all rights in the thesis in its present version or future versions. I agree that the institutional repository administrators and the British Library or their agents may, without changing content, digitise and migrate the thesis to any medium or format for the purpose of future preservation and accessibility.

4. DECLARATIONS

(a) I DECLARE THAT:

- I am the author and owner of the copyright in the thesis and/or I have the authority of the authors and owners of the copyright in the thesis to make this agreement. Reproduction of any part of this thesis for teaching or in academic or other forms of publication is subject to the normal limitations on the use of copyrighted materials and to the proper and full acknowledgement of its source.
- The digital version of the thesis I am supplying is the same version as the final, hard-bound copy submitted in completion of my degree, once any minor corrections have been completed.
- I have exercised reasonable care to ensure that the thesis is original, and does not to the best of my knowledge break any UK law or other Intellectual Property Right, or contain any confidential material.
- I understand that, through the medium of the Internet, files will be available to automated agents, and may be searched and copied by, for example, text mining and plagiarism detection software.

(b) IF I HAVE AGREED (in Section 2 above) TO MAKE MY THESIS PUBLICLY AVAILABLE DIGITALLY, I ALSO DECLARE THAT:

- I grant the University of Warwick and the British Library a licence to make available on the Internet the thesis in digitised format through the Institutional Repository and through the British Library via the EThOS service.
- If my thesis does include any substantial subsidiary material owned by third-party copyright holders, I have sought and obtained permission to include it in any version of my thesis available in digital format and that this permission encompasses the rights that I have granted to the University of Warwick and to the British Library.

5. LEGAL INFRINGEMENTS

I understand that neither the University of Warwick nor the British Library have any obligation to take legal action on behalf of myself, or other rights holders, in the event of infringement of intellectual property rights, breach of contract or of any other right, in the thesis.

Please sign this agreement and return it to the Graduate School Office when you submit your thesis.

Student's signature:  ate: 1/1/2012

**Drama and Multiculturalism:
Power, Community and Change**

By

Bethany Nelson

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Education
University of Warwick, Institute of Education, August, 2011

Table of Contents

List of Tables	8
Acknowledgements	9
Declaration of Publications	10
Abstract	11
Chapter One Introduction	12
1.1 My Interest in the Topic	12
1.2 Research Design	14
1.3 Preliminary Study	15
1.4 Phase One: Process Drama	15
1.5 Phase Two: Playmaking	16
1.6 Research Methods	17
1.7 Structure of the Dissertation	18
1.8 Conclusion	18
 Chapter Two Literature Review	 20
2.1 The Ideology Dilemma	21
2.1.1 Contested Spaces	25
2.1.2 Philosophical Options	27
2.1.3 Discussing Fraser	30
2.2 Ideologies in Schools	35
2.2.1 Schools and Social Reproduction	35
2.3 Schools as the Solution	39
2.3.1 The Role of Curriculum	42

2.4	Ideologies of Community	44
2.4.1	Discussing Bauman	46
2.4.2	In Defense of Community	51
2.5	The Role of Applied Theatre	52
2.5.1	Concerns	57
2.6	Conclusion, Part 1	59
2.7	Community and Power	60
2.7.1	Constructions of Power	61
2.7.2	Power and Action	62
2.7.3	Sense of Community	63
2.7.4	Communal Power Orientation	64
2.7.5	Concerns	65
2.8	Conclusion, Part 2	66
Chapter 3	Methodology	68
3.1	Project Overview	68
3.2	Theoretical Underpinnings	69
3.2.1	Social Constructivism/Constructionism	71
3.2.2	Case Study	73
3.2.3	Grounded Theory	75
3.2.4	Inductive Analysis	77
3.2.5	Critical Change Theory	78
3.3	Reflexive Practice for Researchers	80
3.3.1	Teaching, Critical Change Theory, and Reflectivity	83

	3.3.2 My Orientation	84
3.4	The Road Not Taken	87
3.5	Methods	90
	3.5.1 Data Collection	90
	3.5.2 Interviews	91
	3.5.3 Obtaining Access and Consent	92
3.6	The Preliminary Study	93
	3.6.1 Preliminary Study Design	94
	3.6.2 Preliminary Study Interviews	98
	3.6.3 Coding Categories	98
	3.6.4 Lessons Learned	100
3.7	Phase One Design	102
	3.7.1 Survey	109
	3.7.2 Coding Categories	110
	3.7.3 Lessons Learned, pt. 2	111
3.8	Phase Two Design	112
	3.8.1 Interviews	118
	3.8.2 Data Collection and Triangulation	119
	3.8.3 Coding Categories	119
3.9	Concerns, Ethical and Otherwise	121
Chapter 4	Data Analysis of the Preliminary Study	122
	4.1 Introduction	122
	4.2 Project Design	123
	4.3 Observation	124

	4.3.1 Community	128
4.4	Preliminary Study Interviews	131
	4.4.1 Coding Categories	132
4.5	Constructions of Power	133
	4.5.1 Social Power	136
4.6	Power and Action	137
4.7	Sense of Community	138
4.8	Communal Power Orientation	143
4.9	Negative Cases	146
4.10	Limitations of the Analysis	148
4.11	Conclusion	149
Chapter 5	Data Analysis of Phase One: Process Drama	152
5.1	Introduction	152
5.2	Project Design	153
5.3	The Pre-Project Observation	156
	5.3.1 Classroom Community	157
	5.3.2 Student Constructions of Power	160
	5.3.3 Community and Power	161
5.4	Pre-Project Survey	162
5.5	Coding Categories	164
5.6	Baseline Constructions about Power	165
5.7	Immigrant Status and Poverty as Factors in Cultural Hegemony, Past and Present	167
	5.7.1 Discussion: Ludlow	176

	5.7.2 Contemporary Labor Issues	177
5.8	Collective Action	184
5.9	Community and Power	190
5.10	Negative Cases	198
5.11	Limitations of the Analysis	199
5.12	Conclusion	200
 Chapter 6	 Data Analysis of Phase Two: Playmaking	 203
6.1	Introduction	203
6.2	Project Design	205
	6.2.1 Coding Categories	207
	6.2.2 Data Collection and Triangulation	207
	6.2.3 Interviews	208
6.3	Construction of the problem	209
6.4	Inequity as a Societal Issue	212
6.5	Unequal Power Dynamics	219
6.6	Understanding of Collective Power	226
6.7	Voice	230
	6.7.1 Applied Theatre/Drama and Voice	233
6.8	Community	240
	6.8.1 Community with Amy	246
	6.8.2 My Role in the Community	248
6.9	Community and Power	250
6.10	Anti-Community- Negative Cases	256
6.11	Applied Theatre and Community	261

6.12	Limitations of the Analysis	267
6.13	Conclusion	268
Chapter 7	Conclusion	271
7.1	Introduction to the Conclusion	271
7.2	Research Questions	271
7.3	Research Methodology	272
7.4	Data Collection	275
7.5	Critique of the Project	276
7.5.1	Critique: Methods	277
7.5.1.1	Phase One	278
7.5.1.2	Phase Two	279
7.5.2	Critique: Analysis	281
7.5.2.1	Preliminary	281
7.5.2.2	Phase One	281
7.5.2.3	Phase Two	282
7.6	Community	283
7.6.1	The Self in Community	285
7.6.2	Teacher and Community	287
7.6.3	Ideologies of Community	289
7.7	Community and Power	290
7.7.1	Voice	291
7.7.2	Sense of Community	292
7.8	The Ideology Dilemma	297
7.8.1	Student Constructions of Power	298

7.8.2	Money and Power	299
7.9	Contested Spaces	303
7.9.1	Misrecognition and Maldistribution	304
7.10	Schools as Contested Spaces	308
7.10.1	Collective Action	309
7.11	Schools, Social Reproduction and Production	311
7.11.1	Applied Theatre and Drama	313
7.12	Necessary Change	315
7.12.1	Student Voice, Reconsidered	317
7.13	Finding Meaning	319
7.13.1	Pushing the Envelope	320
7.14	Future Options	321
7.15	Conclusion	322
	Bibliography	324
	Appendix	
A	Phase One: Coded Data Sample	338
B	Preliminary Study: Consent Form	345
C	Preliminary Study: Interview Guide	347
D	Phase One: Survey	349
E	Phase Two: Interview Guide	351
F	Preliminary Study: Lesson Plan	352
G	Phase One: Process Drama Plan	354
H	Phase Two: Member Check of Initial Findings	378

List of Tables

Table 3.1	95
Table 3.2	104
Table 3.3	114
Table 5.1	163

Acknowledgements

My thanks to Jonothan Neelands, who taught me everything I know about process drama and provided invaluable insight, motivation and guidance on my path to becoming a scholar and researcher.

To Hessel Flach, for being my true companion in this Herculean effort, for his tireless support, encouragement and prodigious computer skills.

To my children, who gave me the time and space to finish this, and a reason to work for change.

And thanks to Amy Czarnowski and the students of Chelsea High School for allowing me to enter their world and come to a new understanding of my own.

Declaration of Publications

Material addressed in Chapter 4 was used in the following article:

Nelson, B. (2009). Beyond Belonging: The Relationship Between Community and Power for Urban Students of Color. *Drama Research: International Journal of Drama in Education*, **1**, pp.60-74.

and in a book chapter in the following text:

Nelson, B. (2011). Power and community in drama. In Schonmann, S., ed. *Key concepts in theatre/drama education*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, pp.81-86.

Material addressed in Chapter 6 was used in the following article:

Nelson, B. (2011). "I made myself: playmaking as a pedagogy of change with urban youth." *Research in Drama Education Journal: the journal of applied theatre*, **16**, no. 2.

These were written during the period of my Doctoral study. This thesis has not been submitted for a degree at another university.

Abstract

This three phase research project, conducted with low-income students of color in an urban high school, addresses the use of process drama and playmaking as primary modes for addressing components of best practice in multicultural education, and altering the reproduction of hegemonic ideologies in schools. Further, the effects of classroom community on the learning outcomes of the project are considered. This is a qualitative study using participant observation as a primary form of data collection, followed by ethnographic interviews. Data analysis followed a primarily inductive process with a focus on the development of grounded theory to explain the outcomes. Discussion of project outcomes are considered in relationship to literature on the nature of ideologies, the ways that public schooling both supports and exacerbates existing dynamics, the suitability of public schools as potential sites of change in these dynamics, and the potential of applied drama/theatre to provide a viable alternative curricular approach for facilitating change in hegemonic reproduction in schools.

Chapter One

Introduction

1.1 My Interest in the Topic

There are gritty realities out there, realities whose power is often grounded in structural relations that are not simply social constructions created by the meanings given by an observer... Structural conditions can never be ‘thought away’, they must be thought ‘through’ in order to be ‘acted away’... (Apple, 1995, pp.xiii-xiv).

We need a conversation and time is running out (Tatum, 2007, p.xv).

Schools do not simply reflect the problems of the larger society, they perpetuate them. Schools are designed to create citizens, fill market needs, and generally replicate the socioeconomic divisions represented by the student population and in society as a whole (Apple, 1995; Apple and Buras, 2006). Consequently, students of color and the urban poor experience the same oppression and lack of substantial opportunities for advancement in schools that are reflected in wider society. They attend schools that are under-resourced and prepare them to fill the same lower socio-economic slots occupied by the members of their communities (Fine and Weis, 2003; Apple, 1995; Ladson-Billings, 2009).

Pervasively institutionalized, Eurocentric norms generate racially specific forms of status subordination, including stigmatization and physical assault; cultural devaluation, social exclusion, and political marginalization; harassment and disparagement in everyday life; and denial of the full rights and equal protections of citizenship (Fraser and Honneth, 2003, p.23).

Further, “young people who are subjugated by oppressive social, economic and cultural forces are denied any real sense of agency and lack a capacity to act on and change their world” (McInerney, 2009, p.28). I think this is wrong, and needs to be changed.

Educational theorists agree that the development of identity is a critical task of schooling and should disrupt socially imposed constructs around race, class, gender, sexuality, and traditional power roles. By utilizing curriculum, pedagogy, and structural dynamics that integrate opportunities for students to think critically, explore multiple perspectives, experiment with a range of identities, and draw connections between the oppression they experience in their lives and larger social dynamics, students in schools will be better prepared to participate in redefining themselves and the society of which they are a part (McInerney, 2009; Gallagher, 2007; Fine and Weis, 2003; Freire, 1993). Further, theorists on culturally relevant teaching agree on the importance of the establishment of community as a necessary factor for facilitating school success for urban students of color (Ladson-Billings, 2009). Reflecting a communal orientation characteristic of the home cultures of many urban students generates a sense of belonging for individual students, and allows them to scaffold new learning on familiar group dynamics.

Through process drama and playmaking, I suggest that we may be able to create communities of learners engaged in a collective struggle against the status quo. Process drama and playmaking are potentially effective tools for facilitating the development of community among students and between students and teachers, exploring unequal power dynamics, and practicing various forms of power. My purpose is two-fold. I want to generate evidence on the efficacy of

different forms of educational drama to address core goals of culturally relevant education, with the intention of justifying/creating a niche for drama strategies as effective tools for teaching urban students of color. A secondary goal is to publish in this area, creating a platform for pursuing soft money funding for these approaches, which have too long fallen between the cracks of drama and theatre definitions in funding agencies.

1.2 Research Design

This project was conducted in three parts, each with a different class of high school students in an urban system in Chelsea, Massachusetts, USA. The design of the project included a brief preliminary study intended to establish some baseline understanding of students' constructions about power, followed by a comprehensive two phase study on the effects of 1) process drama and 2) playmaking on two elements of best practice in multicultural education: 1) the need to teach explicitly about unequal power dynamics and develop curriculum that addresses issues of racism and discrimination, and 2) focus on social change that promotes equity for subordinated groups and facilitates the development of the skills and knowledge needed to become agents of change (Nelson, 2005). For the purposes of the following discussion, process drama refers to drama work that utilizes a variety of drama and theatre conventions, in which "the conventions selected are mainly concerned with the processes of theatre as a means of developing understanding about both human experience and theatre itself" (Neelands, 1990, p.5). Playmaking refers to the use of a variety of drama/theatre techniques to develop original performance work with students which emphasizes

the exploration of their ideas and realities with the goal of developing their voices and visions of the world and bringing them to a broader audience.

1.3 Preliminary Study

The original intent of the preliminary study, which was a component of the research methods course I took, was to provide foundational data on urban students' understandings of power. The research questions guiding this study were:

- How do students define power?
- Where do students see power demonstrated in their daily lives?
- How do power dynamics affect them in school, at home, at work, and in the world?

Though limited in scope, the data generated in this preliminary study would inform a wider research study examining the uses of drama for facilitating students' understandings of power on a societal level and development of strategies for wielding power effectively in self-advocacy efforts.

1.4 Phase One: Process Drama

The first phase of my research utilized process drama as an approach to teaching U.S. labor history and collective action, using the Ludlow Massacre, the climactic conflict of a coal miners' strike in Colorado in 1914, as an exemplar of the dynamics typical of worker-owner conflicts in the past and moving into present day labor situations. The key questions guiding this phase of the research were:

- What are the effects of process drama on facilitating students' understandings of unequal power dynamics, as reflected in cultural hegemony and unequal distribution of resources in their lives?
- What are the effects of integrating social and labor history with contemporary themes in creating a context for understanding current unequal power dynamics?
- In what ways can teaching labor history from the past affect students' constructions of collective action in the present?
- In what ways does the community established in the drama classroom affect students' engagement and facility with the material?

1.5 Phase Two: Playmaking

The second phase of my research utilized playmaking to facilitate students' understandings of the ways in which their own experiences of discrimination were reflected in broader societal trends and to facilitate the acquisition of skills that would allow them to become agents of social change.

The key questions guiding this phase of the research were:

- What are the effects of playmaking on facilitating students' understandings of unequal power dynamics, as reflected in cultural hegemony and unequal distribution of resources in their lives?
- What are the effects of using playmaking structures to facilitate students' identity formation as change agents in the issues that affect their lives?
- How can students acquire advocacy skills through participation in a playmaking experience?

- In what ways does the community established in the drama classroom affect students' engagement and facility with the material?

1.6 Research Methods

This was a qualitative study using participant observation (Patton, 2002) as a primary form of data collection followed by ethnographic interviews “to understand the shared experiences, practices, and beliefs that arise from shared cultural perspectives” (Brenner, 2006, p.358). This structure generates information rich case studies in a social constructivist frame, with the goal of “deeply understanding specific cases within a particular context” (Patton, 2002, p.546). The social constructivist perspective emphasizes “the social world . . . as socially, politically, and psychologically constructed” and offers “perspective and encourage(s) dialogue among perspectives rather than aiming at singular truth and linear prediction” (Patton, 2002, p.546).

The emphasis is on the development of grounded theory, the process of generating theory rather than researching a particular theoretical content. The analysis of the data followed an inductive process, in which most hypotheses and concepts come from the data and are systematically worked out in relation to the data in the course of the research (Patton, 2002, p.125). Coding procedures helped provide some standardization and rigor to the analytical process, as did the search, through the use of alternative coding categories, for opposing theories to explain the outcomes.

The design of this project also touches on aspects of Critical Change Theory (Brenner, 2006; Patton, 2002), in which qualitative inquiry is “a form of critical analysis aimed at social and political change,” approaching fieldwork and

analysis with “an explicit agenda of elucidating power, economic, and social inequalities” (Patton, 2002, p.548).

1.7 Structure of the Dissertation

The structure of the paper follows closely the structure of the project as it developed in practice. For example, the literature review (Chapter 2) reflects both my initial orientation to questions of hegemonic constructions in schools (Apple, 1995; Gramsci, 1971) and the social reproduction of inequitable belief systems (Fraser and Honneth, 2003), and theories on student constructions and pro-social uses of power suggested by the outcomes of the initial study. Decisions governing the research approach for each component of the study is addressed in the chapter on Research Methodology (Chapter 3), and the data from the preliminary study (Chapter 4), Phase One: Process Drama (Chapter 5), and Phase Two: Playmaking (Chapter 6) are each analyzed separately. The conclusion (Chapter 7) considers the meaning of the three components in relation to one another and posits future potentials for the outcomes of the project as a whole.

1.8 Conclusion

The brevity and tidiness of this introduction belie the surprising outcomes of this project. The complexity of the topic, the students’ relationships to it, and the ways in which their sense of community as a group is conflated with their ability to take and wield power has presented me with a new understanding of the potential of process drama and playmaking as teaching tools for urban students of color, and a substantial challenge in attempting to explain why. The literature review which follows is one such attempt—and there are many other ways to

construct this knowledge. It was hard to choose. Ultimately, I opted for an explanation that attempted to honor what the students did, integrate my understanding as a scholar and theorist, and create an intellectual frame which has embedded in it the possibility of change in the dynamics that affect the lives of the students who participated.

Chapter Two

Literature Review

Cultural hegemony in the United States generates inequity which permeates every level of our society. While publicly espousing an ideology of equity and equal opportunity as core values of our society that are supported and protected by our political system, we have tremendous disparities of wealth, opportunity, and achievement among our citizens, particularly along the dividing lines of race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status (Ladson-Billings, 2009; Fraser and Honneth, 2003; Tatum, 2003; Nieto, 2002; Macedo and Bartolomé, 1999; Greene, 1995; Lee, 1995; Goodlad, 1984). The outcomes associated with high poverty schools across the country are bleak: lower test scores, higher dropout rates, fewer course offerings, and low levels of college attendance (Darling-Hammond, 2010; Nieto and Bode, 2007; Banks, 2005; Tatum, 2003).

For the purposes of the following discussion, I will rely on Gramsci's (1971) construction of cultural hegemony as a philosophical and sociological theory, which states that a culturally diverse society can be dominated by a ruling social class through the manipulation and differential valuation of culturally-based beliefs, values, attitudes and perceptions. Freeden (2003), in discussing Gramsci, states that "Gramsci saw the notion of hegemony as a great advance, both philosophical and political, towards a critical and unified understanding of reality," (p.21) involving the "coordination of different interests and their ideological expressions, so that an all-embracing group, possibly society as a whole, would be engaged" (p.20). However the world-view of the ruling class became the societal norm, "obscuring the real condition of society by the interests

of a ruling class” (Freedman on Mannheim, 2003, p.21). Dynamics arising from this multi-layered social construction, and the ideological structures which support and maintain it, are discussed at length below.

This literature review will focus first on characteristics of ideology which contribute to making this an intractable and long-standing problem, the ways that public schooling both supports and exacerbates existing dynamics, the suitability of public schools as potential sites of change in these dynamics, consideration of contemporary ideological constructions of community, and the potential of applied theatre/drama to provide a viable alternative curricular approach for fostering community and facilitating change in hegemonic reproduction in schools. The role of community in facilitating learning for urban students of color will be considered through three bodies of literature- the psychological, social, and behavioral effects of power on individuals, Sense of Community, and communal power orientation.

2.1 The Ideology Dilemma

Ideologies have shaped the political experience of the modern world (Freedman, 2003, p.78).

Michael Freedman (2003) defines a political ideology as

a set of ideas, beliefs, opinions and values that: 1. exhibit a recurring pattern, 2. are held by significant groups, 3. compete over providing and controlling plans for public policy, 4. do so with the aim of justifying, contesting, or changing the social and political arrangements and processes of a political community (p.32).

According to Freeden, Marx considers ideology to be the product of a number of unhealthy causes: 1) need for simple and easily marketed account of the world, 2) desire for power and control over others, and 3) division of labor and alienation of thought from action (in Freeden, 2003, p.7). Marxist philosophers, such as Mannheim, Gramsci, and Althusser, reflect Marxist thought in their philosophical constructions of ideology. Mannheim considered ideology to be a reflection of all historical and social evolution (Freeden, 2003, p.12) while Althusser identified it as the symbolic controller of the repressive state (p.25). Althusser's belief that ideology is something that both happens in us and to us (Freeden, 2003, p.30) is aligned with Gramsci's thought on the existence and nature of ideological hegemony which is conscious for its producers (the wealthy, high status and politically powerful), and more unconscious for its consumers (the powerless, poor and middle class) (p.20). Foucault supports Nietzsche's claim that knowledge is power (Gutting, 2005, p.50) and that power produces knowledge (p.51), or, as Freeden (2003) states, "meaning is culturally privileged" (p.60). Freeden (2003) also points to the "surplus of meaning" that results from a widespread belief in an ideology, in which there are both conscious and subconscious meanings derived from and attached to the belief system (p.46). This surplus of meaning can distort and amplify components of the ideology. Further, the diachronic emergence of meaning interweaves with synchronic constructions and "political ideas become both more abstracted and more imbedded over time" (Freeden, 2003, p.72). These embedded subconscious constructions, created by the powerful to control others, are particularly difficult to deconstruct and change, even when they work against the best interests of those who embrace them.

Habermas (1991) argues that false ideas are widely accepted in order to support institutions (for example, the idea that schools are accessible to all and working for the success of all) and that oppressed and marginalized people cling to these false ideologies. Marx (1998) also addressed the tendency of uncontrolled markets, designed and supported by these false ideas, to create wage slaves and to use the division of labor as a tool to further alienate and oppress the poor. He identified economic life as the chief form of human alienation: “Money is the alienated essence of man’s labour and life, and this alien essence dominates him as he worships it” (Marx in McLellan, 1977, p.27). This presaged Apple’s contemporary thesis on the de-skilling of workers as a tool for increasing profit and driving down wages, furthering the self-alienation of workers (Apple, 1995, p.63). Gramsci’s position supports the idea that power is more often exercised on subaltern groups by consent than by force. The prevailing matrix of power is sustained ideologically “as elites built on existing forms of common sense” giving up small things in the interest of the dominated in order to maintain existing dynamics (in Apple, 1995, p.4), and creating a stratified society in which those who have the power to produce knowledge generate and control the ideology which controls political arrangements and processes.

In describing the two principal dangers of the political system, Habermas spoke prophetically to the situation with which we are currently faced in U.S. society.

...If legally enshrined human rights are unable to protect civil society from erosion by markets and administrative bodies, the sources of communication and discourse on which political institutions depend will dry up. If that happens, political decisions will be more prone to ideological distortion and bias toward powerful interest groups. (Finlayson, 2005, p.120).

If one accepts the Marxian idea that “human beings cannot be free if they are subject to forces that determine their thoughts, their ideas, their very nature as human beings” (Singer, 1980, p.46), then the importance of deconstructing and understanding the ideologies which govern thought and shape political processes is a crucial first step in generating social change directed towards more equitable outcomes.

There are two important conclusions that can be drawn if we consider ideology as being both produced, by those in power in an effort to control others, and consumed, in complex and often self-defeating ways, by those without power, on both the conscious and subconscious level. First is the critical importance of considering in detail the ideologies that frame and support what happens in schools that contribute to the gross differential in outcomes between low-income students of color and middle and upper class white students (Ladson-Billings, 2009; Tatum, 2003; Nieto, 2002; Macedo and Bartolomé, 1999; Greene, 1995). Second is to consider strategies for helping students deconstruct those ideologies, with the goal of bringing into conscious awareness components of thought that work against their achievement and success and trap them in a perpetual second class citizenship (Fraser and Honneth, 2003; Tatum, 2003; Nieto, 2002; Macedo and Bartolomé, 1999).

Feuerbach contended that philosophy must begin with the finite physical world. He argued that thought does not precede existence, existence precedes thought (Singer, 1980, p.24). And, according to Singer (1980), “For Marx, the unity of theory and practice meant the resolution of theoretical problems by practical activity” (p. 43). The construction of philosophy as a response to the physical world, and Marx’s emphasis on practical activity as a means of resolving

theoretical problems speaks to my own interest in using Applied Theatre/Drama to facilitate students' understandings of the ideologies that govern their lives and opportunities.

2.1.1 Contested Spaces

Gramsci (2010) states that hegemony is always contested, and Apple (2006) agrees that "silencing does not necessarily foreclose possibilities for expression and resistance" (p.8). LaClau and Mouffe (1985) argue that the social order only seems fixed; in reality it is constructed or articulated by us. If, as Freeden (2003) contends, "ideologies are not large, unified monoliths but a jigsaw of components that make its definition quite flexible" (p.44), and if, as Donaldo Macedo, in the introduction to Freire's (1993) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, states,

men and women develop their power to perceive critically the way they exist in the world with which and in which they find themselves; they come to see the world not as a static reality but as a reality in the process of transformation (p.12),

then ideological hegemonies can, in theory and practice, be successfully contested, "recast as engines of change and renewal, not just as unbending instruments of dominance" (Freeden, 2003, p.44).

This crucial feature of life is its fundamentally dialogical character. We become full human agents, capable of understanding ourselves, and hence of defining our identity, through our acquisition of rich human languages of expression....We learn these modes of expression through exchanges with others (Taylor, 1992, p.32).

Freeden (2003) identifies the desire to control public policy as a defining characteristic of an ideology and identifies discourse as the communicative practice through which ideology is exercised. He identifies language as "a communicative set of interactions, through which social and cultural beliefs and understandings are shaped and circulated" (p. 103) and, according to Foucault (1980), discourse, or in Bourdieu's (1993) terms "linguistic capital" (p.62), is

power. Further, according to Freeden (2003), post-Marxist thought embraces the idea of ideology as a means of sustaining collective power, in consideration of new constructions of the identity of the individual and a redefining of society. Freeden also identifies the importance of emotions and feelings in ideologies, as socio-political conduct is often centrally emotional in nature, not just rational or analytical, and as a result, ideologies are often communicated through visual and pictorial forms, designed to simultaneously engage people viscerally and intellectually. If one accepts the construction of ideology as a mutable jigsaw of ideas mediated through image and language, thought and feeling, seeking political and social power, then the potential for change is inherent in the system, and applied theatre/drama, with its focus on social and political explorations through verbal, physical, and visual media, has potential as a vehicle for transformation.

According to Apple (1995), “There are gritty realities out there, realities whose power is often grounded in structural relations that are not simply social constructions created by the meanings given by an observer” (p.Xiii). He adds, “Structural conditions can never be ‘thought away’, they must be thought ‘through’ in order to be ‘acted away’” (p.Xiv). Apple and Buras (2006) identify characteristics of successful hegemonic struggles that might facilitate this ‘acting away’:

1. identity politics are a crucial part of all social and educational movements
2. importance of rearticulating dominant subject positions and discourses for counter-hegemonic purposes (teaching about unequal power dynamics)
3. Recognition that the state is always in formation, that there are “spaces” for making change

4. Successful mobilizations embrace a multidimensional concept of grassroots activism and leadership
 5. Broad, *collective* character of movements
 6. the less powerful using the powerful in counter-hegemonic ways
- (pp.276-77).

Further, they identify the need “to seek out those concerns that resonate with oppressed communities, and to use these as starting points for building more progressive alternatives” (ibid, p.273). The question facing us is: which concerns are these? Which progressive alternatives resonate with oppressed communities, offer opportunities for transformative discourse, and can capture the political imagination strongly enough to bring people together in collective power?

2.1.2 Philosophical Options

...no problem is resolved in advance. We have to create the good, under imperfectly known and uncertain conditions... (Castoriadis, 1997, p.400).

The interesting challenge for philosophers is that they are not determining actual outcomes; they’re identifying possibilities seen through the lens of their own experiences. In reading philosophy, I see this as both a strength and a limitation—a strength when Marx, for example, unconstrained by the burden of absolute proof, generates theories of oppression and resistance that inspire generations of philosophers to extrapolate from and build on his ideas, even though many of them have never been realized in action; a limitation when the pursuit of an interesting idea, such as Bourdieu (1993) arguing that all physical space is defined by social space and vice versa, ergo, homeless people have no

social space (p.124), so abstracts reality through the construction of a clever frame as to make it unrecognizable (as I'm fairly certain that homeless people have both a social and physical experience of the world). My goal, in selecting a conceptual frame for considering the ideology which constrains opportunity for urban populations of color, was to find theorists whose 'lenses' seem clear and rooted in actualities, who demonstrate an interest in transforming inequity through their philosophical constructions, who are intellectually engaged in the lives of those oppressed by current ideologies, and whose theory has the potential for practical and transformative action embedded in it.

Bourdieu (1993) establishes the complex nature of the perception of disempowered people in society, and identifies a component of the ideology designed to control our understanding of the scope of the issues they face.

[U]sing material poverty as the sole measure of all suffering keeps us from *seeing* and understanding a whole side of the suffering characteristic of a social order which...has also multiplied the social spaces (specialized fields and subfields) and set up the conditions for an unprecedented development of all kinds of ordinary suffering (*la petite misère*) (p.4).

He points to the importance of recognizing the interaction of poverty and misrecognition as conflated issues in the lives of the poor and oppressed. Taylor (1992) also recognizes the importance of misrecognition and non-recognition for subaltern groups: "Due recognition is not just a courtesy we owe people. It is a vital human need" (p.26). Freire (1993) identifies the interaction of race and class as convergent factors in understanding race-based oppression and Macedo adds, "what is important is to approach the analysis of oppression through a convergent theoretical framework where the object of oppression is cut across by such factors as race, class, gender, culture, language, and ethnicity" (in Freire, 1993, p.15).

Classical liberalism features the belief that "individuals are the prime

political actors, that formal equality is sufficient for constructing just political arrangements, and that human relationships are exchange relationships because social relationships are modeled on rules of the market” (Freedman, 2003, p.68). However, current political arrangements are far from just in their outcomes for large portions of the population, including immigrants, people of color and the poor (Apple and Buras, 2006; Fraser and Honneth, 2003; Apple, 1995; Bourdieu, 1993; Mouffe, 1992). Bourdieu (1993) points to the American ghetto, with its social exclusion and economic privation, as an example of the

social relationships liable to develop when the State jettisons its essential mission to sustain the organizational infrastructure indispensable to the functioning of any complex urban society, pursues a policy of *systemic erosion of public institutions*, and gives in to market forces and to the logic of ‘everyone-for-themselves,’ that is, to relations of brute power that are most favorable to the powerful (p.132).

Honneth and Fraser (2003) debate the possible cause-and-effect relationship and philosophical construction of the joint problems of misrecognition and maldistribution faced by the urban poor, but both agree on the disparity of resources and recognition as twin manifestations of that problem; as Honneth (2003) puts it, “The trend toward growing impoverishment of large parts of the population; the emergence of a new “underclass” lacking access to economic as well as sociocultural resources; the steady increase of the wealth of a small minority...” (p.112). Honneth believes maldistribution is a result of misrecognition and constructs a theory of recognition that, he states, would solve both aspects of the problem. Sennett (2003) supports the importance of recognition as the defining element of the problem, and sees the possibility for solution rooted in the individual. “Mutual recognition has to be negotiated; this negotiation engages the complexities of personal character as much as social

structure” (p.260). I am more interested in Fraser’s construction of maldistribution and misrecognition as covalents and mutually imbricated. Bauman (2001) agrees with Fraser, and states that recognition alone leads to isolationism. Only when paired with issues of social justice do the claims for recognition become fertile ground for ‘mutual engagement and meaningful dialogue’ containing the seeds for the establishment of a broader ethical community (p.78).

2.1.3 Discussing Fraser

Fraser (2003) discusses recognition and redistribution as “*folk paradigms of justice*, which inform present-day struggles in civil society” (p.11) rather than through their disputed philosophical positions. As folk paradigms, redistribution is associated with class politics and is focused on economic injustices, such as exploitation, economic marginalization, and deprivation, while recognition is associated with identity politics (struggles over gender, sexuality, nationality, ethnicity, and race) and focused on cultural injustice, such as cultural domination, non-recognition, and disrespect via stereotypic cultural representation. Consequently, they indicate the need for different remedies; redistribution requires economic restructuring at the societal level to equalize opportunity for disempowered groups through equitable access to necessary resources, and recognition requires cultural or symbolic changes that eliminate stereotypic constructions that lead to “status subordination” (p.21) of groups based on their gender, sexuality, nationality, ethnicity, and race.

Fraser argues that these mutually imbricated factors require different conceptions of the collectivities that suffer injustice. Redistribution theory requires that groups be conceived by class (or in class-like groups), defined

economically by their relationship to an unjust political economy. Recognition theory identifies groups by membership in a cultural variation seen as low in the cultural hierarchy, and evidenced by lesser respect, esteem, and prestige. She concludes that we should strive to abolish group differences, a conclusion which, I believe, belies the strength in group identity experienced by many cultures (Ladson-Billings, 2009; Nieto, 1999; Macdeo and Bartolomé, 1999) and which is unlikely to be accomplished. When subaltern theory was evolving in the mid-80s, Spivak (1996) identified the paradox that, by identifying a group as having a unified perspective, you deny the true range of who they are. In order to give them collective voice, you further deny the complexity of their histories. However, Tully (2004) argues that “struggles for recognition are relational and mutual rather than independent and multiple rather than dyadic” (p.86).

I find myself aligned more closely with Fraser’s (2003) construction of two-dimensional subordinated groups which “suffer both maldistribution and misrecognition *in forms where neither of these injustices is an indirect effect of the other, but where both are primary and co-original*” (p.19), and her assertion that we need both a politics of redistribution and recognition in order to solve the problem. Though I am skeptical of the possibility of conceiving of these as co-original in relation to race/ethnicity, the two factors are so thoroughly confabulated that identifying cause-and-effect in a chicken-and-egg argument seems like a waste of energy. I prefer to consider the folk paradigm identified by Fraser as an example of an ideology applied in action and rendered concrete as a result. The challenge of positive change in this abstracted, concretized belief system can only be facilitated by considering both components in their complex interaction.

I further embrace Fraser's use of justice as a concept which brings maldistribution and misrecognition together in the pursuit of a greater good. According to Fraser, misrecognition is an issue of social status, and the social status model of recognition-misrecognition "constitutes an institutionalized relation of *subordination* and a violation of justice" (p.29). Further, she argues that recognition is "morally binding under modern conditions of value pluralism" (p.30) and that the status model appeals to a conception of justice that can "be accepted by those with divergent conceptions of the good" (p.31). In status subordination, the "wrong" is in social relations, not personal psychology. It is "a matter of externally manifest and publicly verifiable impediments to some people's standing as full members of society" (p.31). And since class structure "institutionalizes economic mechanisms that systematically deny some of its members the means and opportunities they need in order to participate on a par with others in social life" (p.48), "by construing misrecognition as a violation of justice, it facilitates the integration of claims for the redistribution of resources and wealth" (p.33). According to Fraser, justice is served by both redistribution and recognition in an effort to establish norms of "participatory parity" (p.33) for currently disempowered people. Fraser's belief that change is needed to institutions and social practices, not to the psyche of the individual (either the disempowered or those empowered), embeds the possibility of social action leading to real change.

Fraser argues that "in all societies economic ordering and cultural ordering are mutually imbricated" (p.51), influencing, but not determining each other. Iris Marion Young counters that post-structuralist anti-dualism argues that race and class are so intertwined that they are a monolith and that all oppressions are

explained by this monolith (Fraser and Honneth, 2003, p.60). While they are certainly commingled in oppressing disempowered groups, I find it a less helpful construction. If, as Freedman (2003) contends, ideologies seek to control political thought and language (and, thereby, markets) through an appeal to intellect and emotion, using a combination of words, images and symbols, then the mental image of an oppressing monolith constructed of race and class, two major components of unequal opportunity, crushing the oppressed is de-motivating in its formidable mass, and risks causing what Sennett (2003) refers to as “compassion fatigue,” a construct that partly explains people’s inertia and turning away in the face of obvious inequities by race and class (p.146). In my opinion, Fraser’s appeal to the idealized and often referenced American concept of justice has more potential for engaging the minds and hearts of citizens who unthinkingly support an ideology that elevates some while oppressing others.

Fraser’s identification of transformative (as opposed to affirmative) strategies which would address misrecognition by deconstructing and dereifying existing status groupings, acknowledging the “complexity and multiplicity of identifications” (p.77), and seek to replace master dichotomies (black/white, straight/gay) with a “decentered congeries of lower-case differences” (p.77) fostering interaction across differences, seems to offer a place to start. She claims that transformative approaches to maldistribution are solidaristic because they don’t foster misrecognition as a vehicle for elevating some groups at the expense of others, but by reducing inequality without creating stigmatized lower classes.

I see several problems with this construction. Fraser herself touches on the fact that, at times, transformative approaches work against the immediate goals of those seeking increased respect for their identities rather than blurring the lines of

status relationships across the board (p.78). She also recognizes the potential resistance to pursuing long term rather than short term goals, asking, “Should we sacrifice principle on the altar of realism” (p.78)? This brings me back to the strengths and limitations of philosophy. This is an interesting philosophical question which also has very real and substantial implications for the lives of human beings, both now and in the future.

According to Marx (1998), “It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but... their social existence determines their consciousness” (p.160). He further states that if we change material relationships, we can change thinking and the products of thinking. Freire (1987) reflects this bringing together of thinking and doing when he advocates “reading the world” through conscious practical work (p.35), as does Greene (1995) in discussing the social imagination as “the capacity to invent visions of what should be and what might be in our deficient society” (p.5) and identifying the importance of dialogue between people as a starting point for change.

If, as Apple (1995) claims, “the institutions of our society are characterized by contradiction as well as by simple reproduction” (p.87), and freedom is “the power to act and the power to choose” (Dewey, 1931, p.293), then addressing the delicate balance between principle and reality, and considering how ideas can be implemented to generate change, is left to those who move theory into practice, who embody existing ideologies in their daily thoughts and actions. Currently, a primary site of ideological transmission to the next generation is in public schools.

2.2 Ideologies in Schools

Louis Althusser (1993) suggests that ideology is both something that happens *in* us and *to* us, and Foucault asserts that power is always in and around classrooms (Foucault, 1977). Schools are prime sites for communicating the ideologies of society, through the implicit messages of space and structure and the explicit messages of pedagogy, curriculum, and discourse. Utilizing the work of Michel Foucault in considering the importance and influence of space, Fine (2003) considers space as a metaphysical reality, an emotional and pedagogical dynamic which either fosters safety, risk-taking and growth for students, or reflects, through personal and intellectual oppression, the social reproduction dynamics more typical in schools (Fine et al, 2000) in which power, and the reinforcement of White, middle-class power in particular, are apparent in curriculum (What constitutes knowledge?), tracking, the racial and class make-up of staff, faculty, and administration, and in the buildings themselves.

2.2.1 Schools and Social Reproduction

Apple (1995) contends that, “the educational and cultural system is an exceptionally important element in the maintenance of existing relations of domination and exploitation in...societies” (p.9), and that “the traditions that dominate the field assist in the reproduction of inequality while at the same time serving to legitimate both the institutions that recreate it and our actions within them” (p.11). He points to the “intricate interconnections among schools, economy and culture” (p.105) and, as an aspect of the state, schools are seen to engage in legitimization and establish prior conditions necessary for capital accumulation by controlling students’ ability to successfully enter the market, differentially credentialing them relative to race, ethnicity, and class. Apple

identifies human capital theory as the operant policy, in which “schools are critical agencies for industrial growth and for mobility” (p.39) and basically act as sorting devices, allocating individuals to their proper places in the hierarchy to fill market needs rather than providing students equitably with skills and knowledge that facilitate socioeconomic mobility.

Apple (1995) states that “hegemony is constituted by our very day to day practices” (ibid, p.37). In schools, power systems of administrators, teachers, and students reflect wider cultural hegemony, and teachers and administrators impute deviance to students who do not reflect white, middle class norms, serving as a vehicle for social reproduction. McInerney (2009) adds,

Often they are consigned to an ‘at-risk’ category of students – those considered unlikely to achieve basic academic standards or, worse still, drop out of school. A tendency on the part of educators to individualize school success or failure tends to normalize this position (p.25).

Fraser (2006) identifies the problem that arises when “institutions structure interaction according to cultural norms that impede parity of participation” (p.29).

The structures complicit in impeding parity of participation affect teacher-student relationships, the curriculum presented to students, and students’ engagement (or lack thereof) with learning. The nature of student-teacher relationships in an environment of hegemony and oppression can be considered by what Bauman (2001) calls “domination through engagement” (p.33), in which the rulers and the ruled are dependent on one another, and replicate existing dynamics through their interactions. Greene (1995) states,

It may be... that a general inability to conceive a better order of things can give rise to a resignation that paralyzes and prevents people from acting to bring about change. An accompanying ebbing of the sense of personal and communal efficacy may submerge people in the given... (pp.18-9).

Students of color are often denied access to power in schools, and lack a sense of agency in settings when they “have little power over their learning, when learning has little relevance to their lives and aspirations, or when they are devalued or marginalized” (McInerney, 2009, p.24). Martinez (2006) criticizes the “selective tradition” (p.127) at work in schools in which curriculum is often white-centric (Darling-Hammond, 2010; Bigelow, 2001; Nieto and Bode, 2007; Banks, 2005; Bigelow & Peterson, 2002). She states, “students recognize the politics of what counts as knowledge” (p.126), and she identifies binary oppositions in the ways in which teachers value knowledge from the perspectives and traditions of different races, e.g. in which white is normal, red (Native American) is exotic, or white is core (required) and red is peripheral (elective). Apple (2006) identifies compartmentalization as an exacerbating issue in this dynamic, when, in core knowledge history books, both dominant (major story line) and subaltern (minor story line) histories are included but not in relation to each other, emphasizing consensus and ignoring conflict (p.65).

Discourse is identified as the communicative practice through which ideology is exercised and mediated in schools and in society, and, according to Foucault, discourse is power (Foucault, 1980). The control of discourse, “the narrowing of the public space today, the erosion of communication, the silences in the place of dialogue” (Greene, 1995, p.64) is a central factor in the hegemonic control of students of color. Fine (2003) points to the control of discourse which characterizes low-income schools. “Silencing more intimately shapes low income public schools than relatively privileged ones . . . there is more to hide and control and, indeed, a greater discrepancy between pronounced ideologies and lived experiences” (Fine, 2003, p.16).

Apple (1995) identifies the ways that the public school system works with cultural roles and the economy to maintain “existing relations of domination and exploitation in these societies” (p.9), and states that “oppressive conditions don’t always spark rebellion. Sometimes they blunt critical consciousness and reinforce existing power structures” (Apple and Buras, 2006, p.10). According to Foucault (1977), we internalize the norms by which we’re controlled and become monitors of our own behavior, controlling ourselves for “them.” A further complication lies in what Apple (1995) describes as replication through resistance, in which disengaged students, faced with curriculum that doesn’t reflect their cultures and histories, delivered by teachers whose job success is measured by student outcomes on standardized tests that measure narrow, decontextualized facts (Kohn, 2011; McNeil, 2000), in environments designed to silence them and restrict their mobility, refuse to cooperate, thereby reinforcing stereotypical beliefs regarding their interests and capabilities (Bauman, 2001; Apple, 1995; Bourdieu, 1993). Bourdieu (1993) points to the gap between school and life as a factor in perpetuating this self-destructive behavior, a reaction to “the constant and relentless confrontation with a universe closed on all sides” (p.62) “forcing them to be defiant and compounding their despair” (p.63) and preventing them from becoming “what they would be more often and more fully if the world treated them differently...” (p.64).

Gandin (2006) claims that “we have become skeptical of real educational transformations” (p.218), in part because “hegemonic forces set the agenda, and the progressive movements must operate within the field constructed by these forces” (p.220). Foucault (1977) believes that marginalized groups can define themselves only through their struggles with power. I’m not certain that it’s the

only way, but it seems clear that addressing and challenging hegemonic ideologies communicated in schools is a necessary step in redirecting the discourse that supports inequitable outcomes and preparing students to engage in the political arena to work for change. To quote Habermas (1994): “I’m not saying we’re going to succeed in this; we don’t even know whether success is possible. But because we don’t know, we still have to try” (p.97).

2.3 Schools as the Solution

However, discursive constructions are key, as Michel Foucault argues. They set limits on what is imagined as possible (Weis, 2003, p.86).

There is widespread agreement on the importance of education as a vehicle of ideological change (Fine and Weis, 2003; Apple, 1995; Greene, 1995; Freire, 1970a; Dewey, 1931). Apple (1995) asserts that schools, as a critical “arm of the state” (p.48) produce as well as distribute knowledge, belief and norms. He states, “reproduction is only secured after considerable ideological work and is thus susceptible to educational work of an oppositional or counter-hegemonic kind” (p.158) and that “[schools] can provide a significant terrain over which serious action can evolve” (p.10). Further, “how we act on the world...is in part determined by the way we perceive it” (p.63), therefore, if students have a changed understanding of the world, they may be positioned to act on it differently. He emphasizes that both cultural and politico-economic action are necessary at the same time (Apple, 1995), reflecting Nancy Fraser’s contention

that both redistribution and reproduction need to be addressed simultaneously in order to generate change in existing dynamics (Fraser and Honneth, 2003).

Many theorists and practitioners agree that the dialogic nature of learning is a crucial factor in the transformation of our current hegemonic ideology (Freedman, 2003; Apple, 1995; Greene, 1995; Taylor, 1992; Freire, 1970a), and Gintis (1980) argues the emancipatory potential of liberal discourse (p.191). Based on Freire's philosophy, Shor (1992) outlines an 'empowering' alternative pedagogy that incorporates (among other principles) a commitment to dialogic learning, democratic practices, critical reflection, student activism and multiculturalism (pp.33–35). Martin (2004) claims that engaging students in dialogue about their everyday concerns and "encouraging them to make connections with the broader exploitative social structures and relationships" (p.2) (in Freire's model) can foster critical consciousness. Further, theorists point to the importance of the creation of public spaces (Habermas, 1991; Greene, 1995; Arendt, 1958) "within which potentially more socially democratic articulations and educational visions might be formed" (Pedroni, 2006, p.113).

We should think of education as opening public spaces in which students, speaking in their own voices and acting on their own initiatives, can identify themselves and choose themselves in relation to such principles as freedom, equality, justice, and concern for others (Greene, 1995, p.68).

Fine (2000) argues for the creation of "safe" spaces as critical for interrupting the reproduction of existing social inequities, "a space in which racial, gendered, and economic power are self-consciously analyzed and interrupted; a space in which re-vision is insisted upon..." (Fine, et al, 2000, in Fine and Weis, 2003, p.117). Fine emphasizes "the power of the space in freeing an imagination for racial justice" (ibid, p.132) in which "power and differences are explored, community is built, and education for democracy flourishes" (Fine, 2003, p.7).

Gutting (2005) in discussing Foucault, asserts that “when thoughts change, the causes are the social forces that control the behavior of individuals” (p.50), and that politics are always local. Apple extends this idea when he says that “structural changes in our society need to be prefigured in local experiments” (p.115). Consequently, if the local politics of schools can be changed, then we have the opportunity to change the behavior that supports inequity. Gandin (2006) believes that hegemonic discourse can’t control all points at all times, and advocates counter-hegemonic action in schools with the goal of making oppressed groups agents in their worlds. He discusses as an example the approach taken by Citizen Schools, which employed the hegemonic discourse of education as a tool to feed capitalism (emphasizing the importance of education to get money allocated) and disarticulated it from hegemonic goals, then re-articulated it to their own ends, creating citizens *in* schools, not consumers *of* schools (pp.221-22).

Fraser (2003) states that “poor and working people may need...to build class communities and cultures in order to neutralize the hidden injuries of class and forge the confidence to stand up for themselves” (p.24). Students sharing a physical and social space for 7 hours a day have a unique opportunity to forge these communities if the social forces of administrators and teachers are working to encourage and support this effort, rather than discouraging it in the interests of behavioral control and social reproduction. Greene (1995) points to the role of teachers in fostering positive change in the hegemonic dynamics in schools. “I am convinced that, in the domain of education today, people can choose to resist the thoughtlessness, banality, technical rationality, carelessness, and “savage inequalities” (Kozol, 1991) that now undermine public education at every turn” (p.2). Dewey (1931), Freire (1970) and Greene (1995) identify education as the

site of change in the inequities that characterize our society. Dewey (1931) conceives knowledge as a “change in reality” (p.54) and Freire discusses the need to render abstract realities concrete so that “reality has ceased to look like a blind alley and has taken on its true aspect: a challenge men must meet” (1970a, p.96). Greene (1995) states that, “where people cannot name alternatives or imagine a better state of things, they are likely to remain anchored or submerged” (p.52). She adds, “When teaching, responding to the grasping consciousness of a young student in his or her distinctiveness, we can only continually combat life’s anesthetics, moving individuals to reach out toward that horizon line” (p.30).

Greene (1995) considers the role of curriculum in laying a possible foundation for change.

Only when the given or the taken-for-granted is subject to questioning, only when we take various, sometimes unfamiliar perspectives on it, does it show itself as what it is- contingent on many interpretations, many vantage points, unified (if at all) by conformity or by unexamined common sense. Once we can see our givens as contingencies, then we may have an opportunity to posit alternative ways of living and valuing and to make choices” (p.23).

Nicholson (2005) agrees, stating, “For Marxists, including Freire, praxis is regarded as an active process of critical engagement with experience aimed at disrupting established power relations, on both a material and intellectual level” (p.43).

2.3.1 The Role of Curriculum

If resistances are found, if even only on an informal level we find men and women in our businesses, factories, and elsewhere struggling to maintain their knowledge, humanity and pride, then curricular action maybe *more* important than we realize (Apple, 1995, p.81).

Apple (1995, 2006) argues for the importance of a curriculum that teaches the history of workers’ struggles and visions: “the history of what people strived for, of the visions of a more equitable society, and of the demands for and

struggles over them, all of this needs to be made visible and legitimate once again” (p.157). In support of introducing to students a politicized curriculum incorporating collective action, unionization, and workers’ rights, he states,

Their own current conditions remain relatively unanalyzed, in part because the ideological perspectives they are offered (and the critical tools not made available) defuse both the political and economic history and the conceptual apparatus required for a thorough appraisal of their position. The possibility of concerted action is forgotten (ibid, p.117).

He believes, as Fraser does, that both cultural and politico-economic action are necessary at the same time, and advocates for the political education of teachers. I think that Apple’s emphasis on the potential efficacy of reintroducing curriculum about labor history is overstated. However, I agree that it is a necessary step in mitigating existing dynamics, particularly if the school environment can be altered to become a “contested discursive space within which potentially more socially democratic articulations and educational visions might be formed” (Apple, 2006, p.113). Further, I think that giving students access to new language (collective action, power asymmetry, etc.) in an environment in which they have membership in a changed dialogue, has the chance to change their orientation to inequity and oppression.

Bernal (2006) details a culturally specific approach to developing leadership in Chicana youth through the Mexican American Youth Leadership Conferences in East Los Angeles. The women who participated remembered the experiences as helping them develop a “sense of community and family responsibility” and “a consciousness” through mentoring by older Mexicans who “were opening up our eyes” (p.144). As a result of this culturally relevant teaching approach, in which leadership was reconsidered as a collective process where members of a group were “empowered to work together synergistically

toward a common goal or vision” (p.149), the participants formed Young Chicanos for Community Action (YCCA), providing student leadership in the 1968 School Blowouts in East Los Angeles, in which students successfully demanded improvement in their under-resourced, violent, and failing schools. This example of schools offering students (in this case, unintentionally) leadership curriculum which utilized their cultural orientation, community of origin, and explicit teaching about power, resulting in their reframing of leadership as a culturally defined dynamic that raised their consciousness and allowed them to transform community ties into a political force, offers a practical application of the theory discussed above, and introduces the importance of collectivity and community orientation for urban students of color.

It is essential that we remember that the reproductive process in which these students in schools...participate is not all powerful. It *is* contested. There *are* elements of good sense in it. There are alternative collective practices generated out of it on... the cultural level. (Apple, 1995, p.118)

Sennett (2003) acknowledges the challenge of deconstructing the bricolage, disassembling a culture into pieces, then packing it for travel, but, as Arendt (1961) argues, we must

decide whether we love our children enough not to expel them from our world and leave them to their own devices, not to strike from their hands their chance of undertaking something new, something unforeseen by us, but to prepare them in advance for the task of renewing a common world (p. 196).

A consideration of the ideology of community currently at work in schools, and its effect on students, follows.

2.4 Ideologies of Community

Ideological constructions of the role of community today work against the strengths and cultural beliefs of many urban students of color in public schools.

Theorists on culturally relevant teaching agree on the importance of the establishment of community as a necessary factor for facilitating school success for urban students of color (Ladson-Billings, 2009; Tatum, 2003; Nieto, 2002; Macedo and Bartolomé, 1999; Lee, 1995). The establishment of community in the classroom and school environment reflects the communal orientation that characterizes the home cultures of many urban students, generates a sense of belonging for individual students, and allows them to scaffold new learning on familiar group dynamics. However, the ideology of individualization is prevalent in schools, in which students are encouraged to conceptualize themselves as single players in a sociological game, rising or falling on their own merits (Giroux, 2011; Bauman, 2008). Though humans have a deep need for community, what Hannah Arendt (1958) calls an intangible ‘web of human relationships,’ the unseen in-between that connects people by what they have in common (p.57), and Zygmunt Bauman (2001) calls “the search for common humanity” (p.141), it is elusive in contemporary society. Students of color, who often come from cultures in which the focus on community is central to their identity, find themselves in an environment in which community is increasingly difficult to find and maintain.

...the storm brewing in the United States and other parts of the globe represent a kind of anti-progress, a refusal to think about, invest in or address the shared responsibilities that come with some vision of the future and ‘the good society.’ Composing meaningful visions of the good society that benefit citizens in general, rather than a select few, are now viewed as ‘a waste of time, since they are irrelevant to individual happiness and a successful life’ (Bauman, 2008, p.88). Bounded by the narrow, private worlds that make up their everyday lives, the American public has surrendered to the atomizing consequences of a market-driven morality and society and has replaced the call for communal responsibility with the call to further one's own interests at all costs (Giroux, 2011).

Bauman (2008) argues that in such a society:

[I]ndividual men and women are now expected, pushed and pulled to seek and find individual solutions to socially created problems and implement

those solutions individually using individual skills and resources. This ideology proclaims the futility (indeed, counter productivity) of solidarity: of joining forces and subordinating individual actions to a ‘common cause.’ It derides the principle of communal responsibility for the well-being of its members... (p.88).

Bauman (2001) states that “troubles are supposed to be suffered and coped with alone and are singularly unfit for cumulation into a community of interests which seeks collective solutions to individual troubles” (p.86).

Finlayson (2005), discussing Habermas, considers the picture of society as a group of lone individual reasoners, each “calculating the best way of pursuing their own ends” (p. 51), as false. He points instead toward the “crucial role of communication and discourse in forming social bonds between agents” (p. 51). Habermas (1979) identifies the importance of “the ability to think of people wildly different from ourselves as included in the range of ‘us’” (p. 192), and Greene (1995) argues that education should provide situations in which students discover what it is to experience obligation and responsibility, derived from caring for and being cared for, or from a sense of justice and equity.

2.4.1 Discussing Bauman

Zygmunt Bauman is a central figure in exploring current ideological constructions of community, and consequently I will discuss him here, though I think he personifies some of the strengths and limitations of philosophy in describing these constructions. For example, he presents the idea of community past in such glowing terms, describing it as a “paradise lost” (Bauman, 2001, p.3) and ““a naïve immersion in human togetherness”” (p.10) now available only in dreams, and possessed of “communal innocence, pristine sameness, and tranquility” (p.18). He cites Redfield (1971) who identifies true community as conforming to the following:

no motivation towards reflection, criticism or experimentation
 community true to its ideal model only as it is distinctive from other
 groupings
 small so as to be within view of all of its members
 self-sufficient so it provides for all or more of the activities and needs
 of the people in it.
 a cradle-to-grave arrangement.

Given this description, community is not only impossible to achieve in current times, it was impossible to achieve in the past. I'd argue that this form of community never existed except as an idea; this is a paradise of story. In my opinion, to define community in a way that negates people's lived experience of it is to imply that the life of ideas constitutes reality, and lived experience comes up a distant second. These constructions create a situation in which "good" community can no longer be achieved, and all other community is considered 'less than,' as human fallibility prevents us from reaching this unattainable goal.

Bauman discusses the range of challenges to finding, building and maintaining community today, addressing at length a conception of contemporary community as restrictive, controlling, and lacking in the unconditional support present in the past (Bauman, 2001, p.10). He identifies a current trend toward superficial communities that are perfunctory and transient, which don't "weave a web of ethical responsibilities and long term commitments" (p.71). He calls aesthetic communities, such as those developed through shared aesthetic experiences, "peg communities" (p.71) (hang a common problem on the peg, then move it later).

Bauman (2001) states that the ‘really existing community’ of today reflects common understanding that is attained through a conscious struggle, selected from a mass of variety in the pursuit of “sameness” (p.14), and therefore lacks the sense of membership and support of communities of the past, adding to its members’

fears and insecurity instead of quashing them or putting them to rest. It will call for twenty-four hours a day vigilance and a daily resharpening of swords; for struggle, day in day out, to keep the aliens off the gates and to spy out and hunt down the turncoats in their own midst (Bauman, 2001, p.17).

I question the construction of community as either a mindless paradise or an unstable fault line. I would argue that there can be a “warm circle” (Rosenberg, in Bauman, p. 10) without mindless obedience, though there may be non-negotiable components of community membership. It seems possible that such communities, the result of conscious thought and choice, may be more resilient and less threatened by new ideas.

As a coda, Bauman does acknowledge the full communal orientation of ethnic minorities but states that they are not communities of choice. And in discussing the ghettoization of many such communities, Bauman states, “Ghetto life does not sediment community...Sharing stigma and public humiliation does not make the sufferers into brothers; it feeds mutual derision, contempt, and hatred...’to be more like them’ means to be more unworthy than I already am” (p.121). I’d argue that there’s a difference between the external ascription of community by race (by the power collective) and the internal experience of community by cultural tradition. Given the role community plays in the lives of many cultures, this seems an oversimplification and dismissal of their lived experience.

Bauman's thesis on the history of community during industrialization has resonance for the ways in which schools discourage student community and foster an ethic of competition and individualization that works against achievement by urban students of color. According to Bauman (2001) "The war declared on community was waged in the name of freeing the individual from the inertia of the mass" (p.27) with the goal of removing the power of the community in order to re-insert the individual into the labor force (Bauman, 2001, Apple, 1995). Modern capitalism 'melted all solids' (as Marx and Engels put it) and "self-sustained and self-reproducing communities were high on the list of solids lined up for liquefaction" (Bauman, 2001, p.30).

The 'masses' were wrested out of the stiff, old routine (the habit-ruled web of communal interactions) to be squeezed into a stiff new routine (of the task-ruled factory floor), where their suppression could better serve the cause of the suppressors' emancipation (Bauman, 2001, p.27).

The dissolution of cultural communities was followed by attempts by philanthropic industrialists to create "model villages" to improve worker satisfaction and productivity and create communities centered around the place of work, in order to buttress the coercive powers of the machine and make factory employment a "whole life" pursuit.

The argument made by schools for emotionally removing students from their home communities is similar. School personnel cite the fact that home languages inhibit success in English-only schools, as states adopt increasingly restrictive laws governing the use of home language in instruction (San Miguel, 2004). Schools identify the range of cultures, races and ethnicities present in the environment and point to cultural practices which work against the goals of the educational system. The "command, surveillance, and punitive regime" (Bauman, 2001, p.27) practiced in post-industrial factories is familiar to urban students

(Gallagher, 2007) and, as dissolution of community prepared workers for factory life, so, too are students of color prepared for their place in the job market. Interestingly, as years of repression and increasingly stringent behavioral controls have failed to generate sufficient school success in urban students of color to fill our market needs, school reform has turned to attempts to establish inter-school communities (through fostering grade-level community, small group mentors, and club-based communities around life issues, to name a few) to combat student-generated community represented by gang membership, teen pregnancy, and other counter-productive strategies (Ladson-Billings, 2009; Tatum, 2007; Fine and Weis, 2003). Much as industry did, schools have discovered that years of coercion have failed to generate success for students of color, and many urban schools now attempt to bridge the gap between home and school communities by trying to bring families and communities into schools as partners.

Bauman identifies the differential valuing of community as a class issue. He points to modern day “patricians,” in love with their own self-made success, who resist engagement with communal solidarity, seeing it as a threat to “what they have” (p.51). Dench (1986) states that the privileged view community and communality as ‘a philosophy of the weak’ due to the accompanying fraternal obligation. Therefore, those who can afford to opt out of it, which Reich (1991) refers to as the “secession of the successful” (p.282). Dench (1986) adds, “The society open to all talents soon becomes for practical purposes one in which failure to display special ability is treated as sufficient grounds for consignment to a life of submission” (p.59). This is evident in schools when students, disadvantaged by the system due to race and class, fail to excel and are consigned

to replicate their parents' socio-economic lot, which Bauman refers to as "a prospectless misery" (p.59). According to Bauman,

‘The powerful and successful’ cannot easily dispose of the meritocratic world view without seriously affecting the social foundation of the privilege which they cherish and have no intention of surrendering. As long as that worldview is upheld, and made into the canon of public virtue, the communal principle of sharing cannot be accepted (p.59).

2.4.2 In Defense of Community

The liberal conception of freedom has led to a paradox: we have each chosen in our own interests, but the result is in no one's interest.

Individual rationality, collective irrationality (Singer on Marx, 1980, p.90).

Bauman's bleak picture of the socioeconomic and cultural aspects of community, in which, in a culture of fear, "‘community’ stands for isolation, separation, protective walls and guarded gates" (Bauman, 2001, p.114), renders critical the need to foster community in schools in which the next generation is inculcated with the ideologies which will, in part, shape their political beliefs and actions, either supporting the cultural hegemony which currently constrains their futures or challenging it. Bauman (2001) posits the possibility of establishing ethical community, characterized by long-term commitments, inalienable rights, fraternal sharing and unshakeable obligations, whose durability makes it a known variable around which the future is planned. He identifies two necessary tasks which must be invoked by community to counter the pathologies of current society: 1) the equalizing of resources so that everyone has equal opportunity, and 2) collective insurance against individual incapacities and misfortunes. He acknowledges that "for most of us such control can be gained only collectively" (p.149).

Etzioni (1997) contends that

Neither human existence nor individual liberty can be sustained for long outside the interdependent and overlapping communities to which we all belong. Nor can any community long survive unless its members dedicate some of their attention, energy and resources to shared projects (p.7).

Freire (1977) supports the need for collectivity, stating, “No one frees another.

No one frees himself. People free themselves together” (p.58). Castoriadis

(1997) adds,

...the alpha and omega of the whole affair is the deployment of social creativity- which, were it unleashed, would once again leave far behind it all we are capable of thinking today... To ‘reasonably convince’ people today means to assist them in attaining their own autonomy (p.414).

For urban students of color, the attainment of autonomy is intimately connected with the establishment of community in the school environment (Nelson, 2011).

2.5 The Role of Applied Theatre

...the philosophers have only interpreted the world, the point is to change it...(Marx, in Prentki and Preston, 2009, p. 12)

A sense of a shared concern may well empower in a way that individual concern cannot... Perhaps a sense of agency may best be acquired through a collective rather than an individual state, through a process of interaction rather than individual action. A sense of connectedness may be more than just a sense of belonging. It may work to build that sense of responsibility and reciprocity which forms the invisible web of social capital (Cahill, 2002, p.67).

Greene (1995) asks, “How can we teach so as to provoke questioning of the taken-for-granted, the kind of questioning that involves simultaneously critical and creative thinking and attentive engagement with actualities” (p.175)?

According to Greene (1995), “of all our cognitive capacities, imagination is the one that permits us to give credence to alternative realities” (p.3) and “encounters

with the arts have a unique power to release imagination” (p.27). Greene (1995) identifies the arts as a vehicle for helping students become “wide-awake in the world” (p.4) and engage with others’ stories. Denis Donoghue (1983) states that “with the arts, people can make a space for themselves and fill it with intimations of freedom and presence” (p.129). Greene advocates using the arts to help students develop skills to participate in the democratic community, and to be able to imagine “the possibilities of things being otherwise” (p.34) through “continuous and authentic personal encounters” (p.155). Freedman (2003) identifies myth and story as enjoyable ways of consuming ideological viewpoints, in concert with strong visual imagery and the use of symbols (e.g. the dove of peace, hammer and sickle) to engage people emotionally, quickly evoke a response, and mobilize support, which supports the possibility of using theatre as a tool of ideological change.

Sennett (2003) supports this perception, claiming that “in social life as in art, mutuality requires expressive work. It must be enacted, performed” (p.59), and that “conscious learning only occurs when a person is actively involved in pursuing difficulties, staging them” (p.238). He sees drama as a shared ritual speech act which allows participants to “control the conditions under which they see and are seen” (p.118), and acknowledges the “difficulty of protecting oneself while connecting to others” (p.225) in attempting to create community. The fact that drama is an effective way to build community is nearly a truism in the field, and practitioners point to the way that the fictional community of drama situations fosters the development of real community among participants. In previous research on the effects of drama on classroom community, there is compelling evidence that drama structures facilitate a sense of collaboration between teachers

and students, and within the peer group (Gallagher, 2007; Manley and O'Neill, 1997; Neelands, 1990). "The dramatic arts have a unique capacity to create an experience of community. The collaborative processes of the drama classroom can provide a powerful opportunity to enhance young people's need for belonging and purpose" (Cahill, 2002, p.21). Community is characterized by caring relationships, high expectation messages and opportunities for meaningful participation and contribution (Cahill, 2002). Further, the development of trust, among students and between students and teachers, is identified as a critical element in the establishment of community.

In particular, forms of Applied Theatre and Drama (AT/D) facilitate the development of community among participants (Gallagher, 2007; Cahill, 2002; Nelson, Colby & McIlrath, 2001; Wagner, 1998; Manley and O'Neill, 1997; Neelands, 1990). AT/D, defined by Nicholson (2005) as "dramatic activity that primarily exist outside conventional mainstream theatre institutions, and which are specifically intended to benefit individuals, communities and societies" (p.2) and characterized as "the relationship between theatre practice, social efficacy, and community building" (p.2) is a vehicle for building community among young people engaged in its practice. Prentki and Preston (2009) define AT/D as "an interlocking set of practices based upon some common principles" (p.11), "responsive to ordinary people and their stories, local settings and priorities" (p.9), in which the goal tends to be group (or social) rather than individual transformation. They suggest that practitioners "may prefer to use the theatre process itself as a form of community building, rather than starting from any preconceived idea that a given group of participants share any commonalities" (p.12), and Prendergast and Saxton (2009) state that AT/D "most often involves a

group of community members coming together to explore and present a performance based on some shared issue or concern” (p.135). Taylor (2003) conceives AT/D as “a medium for action, for reflection, but most important, for transformation- a theatre in which new modes of being can be encountered and new possibilities for humankind can be imagined” (p.xxx).

The nature of the transformation offered by AT/D extends beyond the personal to the social and political, where deeply rooted ideologies affect language, thought, and socio-political action. Prentki (2009) states,

The possibilities of transformation are therefore understood as a material, cultural and social vision for change. The concept of transformation can be understood as multi-valent, operating at the political, the geographical, and the individual level; transforming the public sphere of material circumstances, the pedagogical environment and the personal mindset (p.304).

Garth Allen (2006) asserts that

[T]he arts allow those who practice them and those who consume them to imagine alternative states of mind and being. This is a political function of art. Imagined communities allow us to get critical distance and perspectives on our own political condition and potentially to transform it (p.291).

Judith Ackroyd (2000) identifies improving the lives of individuals and creating better societies, whether through process-oriented or performance-based work, as an intended outcome of AT/D, and Preston (2009) states that “the participative features of theatre, performance and creativity in general are increasingly called upon to foster involvement by people in different settings and to meet various developmental, educational, and change agendas” (p.127). In AT/D, processes of working are embodied and involved, demystifying the arts by encouraging people from a range of backgrounds and interests to participate actively. Moclair (2009), in discussing AT/D work on child empowerment in the Sudan, states:

While we are initially concerned with ensuring input from all individuals, it is the resultant recognition that the group amounts to more than the sum of its parts that is of greatest value to us and that best illuminates the empowering, educational and mobilizing potential of this kind of participatory model (p.157).

Neelands (1984) points to the way in which AT/D allows practitioners to forego consensus, which implies a homogeneity of perspectives, in favor of “‘conspectus’ a rainbow of differing opinions all of which are to be recognized and included within a dramatic process” (p.40).

AT/D “often brings into focus questions of allegiance, identity, and belonging” (Nicholson, 2005, p.13), and “invites questions about the contribution we are each making to the process of social change” (ibid, p.23). Advocates of this approach “have regarded its participatory dialogue and dialectic qualities as effective and democratic ways of learning” (ibid, p.38). Nicholson (2005) states that drama works against authoritarian approaches to teaching and learning, offering opportunities for dialogue between teacher and learners (p.55), reflecting Freire’s (1970c) emphasis on active models of pedagogy and the inversion of the power dynamic of teacher and learner, in which learners come “face-to-face with other knowing subjects” (pp.36-7). Nicholson (2005) further claims that “what is learnt depends on how drama is used... the narratives of the participants and the specific social locations and cultural contexts in which the work takes place” (Nicholson, 2005, p.50). This aligns with Giroux’ (1992) support of the importance of addressing culture as a factor in ideological change, expanding opportunities for reflection, exchange, and identity work among an array of dominant and subaltern groups and reinforcing the importance of linking praxis to struggles over real material conditions that effect everyday life.

It is important for critical educators to take up culture as a vital source for developing a politics of identity, community, and pedagogy. In this

perspective culture is not seen as monolithic or unchanging, but as a site of multiple and heterogeneous borders where different histories, languages, experiences and voices intermingle amidst diverse relations of power and privilege (Giroux, 1992, p.169).

Bourdieu (1993) contends that “the dominated are the least capable of controlling their own representation” (p.50) and “they are spoken of more than they speak” (p.51). He discusses the challenge of social transformations in the face of “habitus,” which Bourdieu defines as “the set of durable principles-practices, beliefs, taboos, rules, representations, rituals, symbols, and so on that provide a group with a sense of group identity” (Rao and Walton, 2004, p.15) and determines the extent to which we accept our lot in life. However, as Moclair (2009) states, habitus is not simply a set of values that shackle, but a “treasure chest of cultural and community legacy” (p.158) that holds people’s capacity to aspire. According to Appadurai (2004), “It is in culture that ideas of the future, as much as those about the past are embedded and nurtured” (p.59). Moclair adds that “culture has the ability to determine our sense of the possible” (p.158). Culture is a form of capital and also a form of domination (Rao and Walton, 2004). Moclair (2009) contends that AT/D is a tool for breaking the “shackles of habitus” (p.159), and Appadurai (2004) identifies it as a vehicle for allowing people to practice and increase their capacity to aspire beyond existing norms of domination by experimenting with the hypothetical.

2.5.1 Concerns

Prentki (2009) suggests that AT/D offers the potential to allow people to explore radical ideas and the need for change, but cautions that it can also become a “safe space” (p.364) that domesticates, gently supporting the status quo and teaching people to adapt to existing realities. Kershaw (1992), in discussing “the fundamental problems of culturally interventionist theatre,” states that “the

negotiations between company and community can be exceedingly complex” (p.245), resulting not in a culturally radical or oppositional product, but one which reflects the ideological identification between the practitioners and community of location and that represents “a reinforcement of achieved commonalities” (p.245) that may or may not work against the status quo. Nicholson (2005) agrees that

[T]here is always the need to be vigilant about whether the practice is accepted as a generous exercise of care or whether, however well-intentioned, it is regarded as an unwelcome intrusion. It is easy for trust to become dependence, for generosity to be interpreted as patronage, for interest in others to be experienced as the gaze of surveillance (p.160).

Bundy (2009) points to the assumption made by AT/D practitioners that communities form around a shared purpose, based on the “importance of risk balanced against trust, acceptance, and a sense of power and control” (p.237). In her own work, this can allow the sharing of personal, intimate information by abuse survivors, but she raises the possibility that participants can be further traumatized by listening to other’s stories of oppression and abuse, and considers the complex responsibility of the AT/D practitioner in that situation. In spite of his reservations, Prentki (2009) asserts that:

[E]vidence is all around us that applied theatre is needed now more than ever before. It is needed because it can enable hitherto passive members of groups to transform themselves into active citizens; needed because it is by definition a collective activity in a world where the mass of people lead lives of increasing isolation and fragmentation (p.364).

Kershaw (1992) balances his concerns with the assurance that “authenticating conventions always celebrate their source by raising its public importance through performance” and, “almost always deal[t] with hidden or obscure histories, relationships, issues and problems which were important to the culture from which they were drawn” (p.246).

2.6 Conclusion, Part 1

The mode of being of the new intellectual can no longer exist in eloquence...but in participation in practical life as constructor, organizer, 'permanent persuader'... (Gramsci, 2009, p.139)

Apple and Buras (2006) state that "the voices of the subaltern are strengthened and magnified when articulated in collective ways" (p.281), and "consciousness of relations of subordination and domination is the first step in moving toward the critical sensibility needed to build counterhegemonic movements in education and elsewhere" (p.282). Mouffe (2006) agrees that the democratic framework is susceptible to "being refined through hegemonic struggle" (p.79) and that the way to challenge power relations is through "a process of disarticulation of existing practices and creation of new discourses and institutions" (p.79). Apple (2006) advocates for the progressive modernization of curriculum through finding "spaces for making and remaking curriculum and for engaging in critically oriented educational reforms" (p.280). AT/D is an ideal curricular form for promoting political and oppositional discourse and the theatre classroom, free from the constraining effects of standardized testing, is one of the available public spaces in schools in which to explore these ideas.

Applied Theatre offers students the opportunity to represent themselves in drama and theatre, in both process and product oriented experiences centered around the establishment of communities of influence (Greene, 1995; Foucault, 1977; Arendt, 1958) and the exploration of cultural hegemony in public spaces (Foucault, 1977; Arendt, 1958) which encourage critical discourse and the re-

imagining of the social good (Neelands, 2007; Apple and Buras, 2006; Gramsci, in Apple and Buras, 2006; Nicholson, 2005).

If we accept, as Freedman (2003) contends, that ideologies are not large, unified monoliths but a jigsaw of components, often communicated in visual or pictorial forms, that “can be recast as engines of change and renewal, not just as unbending instruments of dominance” (p.44) and Marx’s (in Singer, 1980) assertion that the resolution of theoretical problems lies in practical activity, then the practical activity of applied drama and theatre, with its visual orientation and creation of a public space in which to engage in critical and counter-hegemonic discourse in a situated community of power offers a fruitful opportunity for fostering students’ understandings of unequal power dynamics and envisioning the possibility of change.

2.7 Community and Power

I began this review with a consideration of existing bodies of literature that create a framework for considering the way in which ideologies, created by the power elite and supported, consciously and unconsciously, by both its beneficiaries and those it oppresses, are enacted in individual, social, and political ways to create cultural hegemony which systematically disadvantages urban students of color in schools. I’ve explored schools as sites which reproduce existing hegemonic dynamics in order to fill market needs for workers at all levels, and considered literature which supports the possibility that schools, which can produce as well as reproduce society, could be an effective site for social change. I’ve explored current ideological constructions of community, and considered the role of various forms of applied theatre/drama in facilitating

community and confronting ideologies that support social and economic inequity. These are not new ideas.

However, the potential addition my research makes to the canon of understanding lies in the exploration of community and power as conflated dynamics in the lives of many students of color. In the final component of this literature review, using primarily quantitative studies on the constructions and uses of power in psychological research, I lay the foundation for grounded theory on the relationship between community and power for urban students of color demonstrated during the applied theatre/drama research I conducted.

2.7.1 Constructions of Power

Keltner, Anderson, and Gruenfeld (2003), in a review of the existing literature on power, acknowledge the difficulty of defining power for the purposes of studying it. They ultimately define power as the ability to modify others' states by providing or withholding resources or administering punishments. They distinguish between psychological and social power, and emphasize the importance of considering them as separate components of human experience. They identify the resources of social power as affection, information, attention, or humor, and social punishments as storytelling, teasing, gossiping, and gift giving.

Keltner et al. (2003) state that the empirical literature on power is guided by 3 questions: First, what are the origins of power? Second, what are the correlates of the experience of power? Third, how does power effect targets of authority? They are most interested in an associated fourth question: How does power change the behavior of the actor? In considering these perspectives, they move away from earlier, simple studies on the ways in which power corrupts the powerful, and is enacted in self-serving ways that disadvantage the powerless, and

consider the positive uses and effects of power for both the powerful and the powerless. They identify studies which demonstrate that power can be used for pro-social purposes, and reference Chen, Lee-Chai, and Bargh (2001), whose work on communal power orientation will be discussed later in this section. They discuss at length the profound effects that power has on every aspect of human functioning, and reflect the belief demonstrated in studies in neural brain chemistry, personality theory, affect theory, and social organization theory that power is the primary factor in approach and inhibition, regulating behavior related to sex, food, safety, achievement, aggression, and social attachment.

2.7.2 Power and Action

The realization of most societal goals, even in situations in which the actor's commitment and knowledge are considerable, requires the application of power (Etzioni, 1968, p.314).

This emphasis on the connection between power and action is reflected in Galinsky, Gruenfeld, and Magee (2003), in which they studied the interaction between high power and goal-directed behavior. In three experiments, in which power primes affected the risk-taking, rule-orientation, and self-interest behaviors of the subjects, respectively, they found that the possession of power leads directly to action. They share with Keltner et al.(2003) the idea that power can be commendable as well as corruptible, and state that “power allows an individual to engage in actions that can promote successful completion of goals and, ultimately, the retention of power” (Galinsky et al., 2003, p.462). They also explore the

disinhibition of behavior relative to accepted norms and rules that may result from high power.

Prilleltensky, Nelson and Peirson (2001), in considering the role of power and control in children's lives, identify the adult-centric and psycho-centric focus of the existing literature on power. They state that power derives from both internal (psychological) and external (social, cultural, institutional) sources, and identify the importance of power as a physical and emotional wellness factor in children's lives. Prilleltensky et al. (2001) identify meaningful decision-making, power, voice, and choice as defining a sense of agency for children. They state that the goal is to create communities in which resources facilitate personal power and control and work towards empowerment, which they define as having enough power to satisfy needs and work in concert with others to advance collective goals.

2.7.3 Sense of Community

In the review of existing literature, Keltner, Gruenfeld, and Anderson (2003) discuss the power of the individual within groups and the power of groups in relationship to other groups, but not the power of communal orientation. Galinsky, Gruenfeld, and Magee (2003) and Prilleltensky, Nelson, and Peirson (2001) acknowledge the importance of power serving collective, as opposed to individual, goals. Literature on Sense of Community (SOC) provides a useful frame for considering the importance of community to the mental and social health of the individual, and the ways in which groups can access and utilize power through their community orientation. Sense of Community was first identified by Adelson and O'Neil (1966) as a psychological construction with adolescents, followed by Sarason (1986), who described psychological SOC as the

feeling that one is part of a readily available, supportive, and dependable structure. McMillan and Chavis (1986) subsequently identified four components of SOC: belonging, connectedness, influence, and fulfillment of needs. They point to the importance of both having power and recognizing it, and Chavis, in particular, has expanded his work on community development processes and community building strategies through the promotion of community, connection, control and the organizing of collective action.

Scot Evans (2007), in his study of 40 Nashville teens in a youth leadership program, and Janis Whitlock (2007), in studying community connectedness and power in 8th, 10th, and 12th graders, come to similar conclusions regarding SOC and power. “Young people suggest that they feel a stronger self-described sense of community in contexts where they experience voice and resonance, some power and influence, and adequate adult support and challenge” (Evans, 2007, p.693). Both studies point to the importance of one or more supportive adults in the environment who acknowledge the competence of the adolescents and support their power in the community context as factors in the successful development of voice and influence in community.

2.7.4 Communal Power Orientation

Chen, Lee-Chai and Bargh (2001), in a much-cited study on relationship orientation as a moderator of social power, experimented with the effects of communal goal orientation on the exercise of power by individuals. Galinsky, Gruenfeld, and Magee (2003) demonstrated that power stimulates action. Chen et al. (2001) hypothesize that high power states activate goal oriented behavior, and that, for people who have a communal rather than exchange orientation, those goals will be directed toward the good of the group, not the individual. They

demonstrate convincingly that power is connected to social goals for individuals, and that high power states, suggested by subtle environmental cues mirroring those in real life (e.g. sitting in a plush professor's chair as opposed to a small wooden chair), stimulate collective goal behavior in communally oriented individuals.

The interaction of these three elements, constructions of power, Sense of Community, and Communal Power Orientation, offers insight into the potential gains in establishing community in schools among students of color, for whom the centrality of community is a held cultural value. The opportunity to explore ideas about power in an environment in which their communal power orientation can be utilized as a pedagogical construct offers them the opportunity to explore, experience and wield power, in order to develop their identities as potential change agents (Nelson, 2009).

2.7.5 Concerns

There are two holes in the existing literature. The first is a lack of explicit studies of adolescents in experimental conditions similar to those conducted with adults, particularly around constructions of power and uses of power by adolescents. Much of what is stated about adolescents is extrapolated from research with adults, and most of the studies I read acknowledged this gap. The second hole is more problematic in my opinion. Much of the work done on community orientation vs. self-interest orientation and SOC is white-centric. The foundational ideas utilized assume attitudes about the goals of life which reflect individuation as the norm, and do not address collective identity as a normative factor, though there are many non-dominant cultures for which that is, in fact, the norm (Ladson-Billings, 2009; Tatum, 2003; Nieto, 2002; Lee, 1995; Fordham &

Ogbu, 1986). Each article mentioned that culture, race, and ethnicity are complicating factors in generalizing the results of their studies, and need to be addressed elsewhere.

2.8 Conclusion, Part 2

Imagination may be a new way of de-centering ourselves, of breaking out of the confinements of privatism and self-regard into a space where we can come face to face with others and call out, 'Here we are' (Greene, 1995, p.31).

No one is free, until we are all free (Habermas, 2002, p.161).

Bauman (2001) claims that "power consists in decision-making and resides with those who make the decisions" (p.40). An understanding of the ways in which ideologies are constructed and by whom, and an exploration of current political and social messages and their implementation in schools as forces of hegemonic reproduction, positions us to consider courses of action designed to interrupt existing inequitable belief systems. Apple (1995) points to the importance of "collective mobilizations" (p.11) and constant labor to make subaltern voices heard, and suggests that "subaltern groups resist the role of spectator, and instead act to challenge current economic structures" (p.29). The use of applied theatre/drama strategies, specifically directed at generating student awareness of embedded and concretized ideas, with the goal of creating an environment conducive to oppositional and counter-hegemonic constructions of

reality, is one such alternative. Finally, consideration of the role of community, and the complex interaction of community and power for urban students of color, indicates a possible focus for the applied theatre/drama experiences.

Vaclav Havel (1983) identifies the importance, for commonality, of “a renaissance of elementary human relationships...Love, charity, sympathy, tolerance, self-control, solidarity, friendship, feelings of belonging, the acceptance of concrete responsibility to those close to one...” (p.372). Through applied theatre, students may be offered the opportunity to engage in a social renaissance in which are planted the seeds of political transformation.

Chapter 3

Methodology

The researcher selects her methods- tools and techniques used to gather evidence, information and data- according to her epistemological and ontological assumptions (Ackroyd, 2006, p.x).

3.1 Project Overview

This project was conducted in three parts, each with a different class of high school students in an urban system in Chelsea, MA, USA. The design of the project included a preliminary study, to establish some baseline understanding of students' constructions about power, followed by a two phase study on the effects of 1) process drama and 2) playmaking on two elements of best practice in multicultural education: 1) the need to teach explicitly about unequal power dynamics and develop curriculum that addresses issues of racism and discrimination, and 2) focus on social change that promotes equity for subordinated groups and facilitates the development of the skills and knowledge needed to become agents of change (Nelson, 2011). Each component was conducted independently of the others, though strategies of implementation, data collection and analysis in each phase were substantially affected by the components that preceded it.

I'll first discuss the theoretical approaches underlying my research design, and shared methods that I employed in all components of the project. I will then detail each individual phase of the project with a focus on methods unique to that phase and identify decisions made which affected the outcomes and

impacted on the subsequent components. I plan to tell this story sequentially, as it happened in the implementation of the project, and critique the effectiveness, or lack thereof, of the various methodologies I used.

3.2 Theoretical Underpinnings

...qualitative data, analyzed with close attention to detail, understood in terms of their internal patterns and forms, should be used to develop theoretical ideas about social processes and cultural forms that have relevance beyond these data themselves (Coffey and Atkinson, 1996, p.163).

One of the strengths of qualitative methods is the inductive, naturalistic inquiry strategy of approaching a setting without predetermined hypotheses. Rather, understanding and theory emerge from fieldwork experiences and are grounded in the data (Patton, 2002, p.129).

The structure of my research is a qualitative study using participant observation (Patton, 2002) as a primary form of data collection. Taylor (2006) defines qualitative research as generally referring to “the practice of investigating and interpreting a culture” characterized by the “commitment to a grounded, field-based or situated activity that locates an observer and a site in the world” in which “questions about authenticity, trustworthiness and power and privilege come to the forefront” (p.7). He points to the fact that this practice “has now been widely adopted in drama education research. Educators have found that the thick

descriptions that qualitative research yields can help to thoroughly recapture the lived experiences of leaders and participants when they encounter dramatic activity” (p.6-7).

According to Patton (2002), the credibility and validity of qualitative research depends on “rigorous methods for doing fieldwork that yield high-quality data that are systematically analyzed with attention to issues of credibility, the credibility of the researcher, and a philosophical belief in the value of qualitative inquiry” (p. 553), including naturalistic inquiry, qualitative methods, inductive analysis, purposeful sampling, and holistic thinking. This reflects Kvale’s (2002) assertion that validity is a quality of “craftsmanship” (p.308), in which the credibility of the researcher is key and “the emphasis is moved from inspection at the end of the production line to quality control throughout the stages of knowledge production” (p.309).

According to Kvale (2002), “In modern social science, the concepts of validity, reliability, and generalization have obtained the status of a holy trinity” (p.300). However, Lincoln and Guba (1985) have reclaimed ordinary language, such as trustworthiness, credibility, dependability and confirmability, to describe these concepts in discussing the truth value of their findings. Kvale (2002) points to the postmodern condition in which the dichotomy between the objective and subjective as distinctly different realities is breaking down. He states that, “The dichotomy of universal social laws and unique individual selves is replaced by the interaction of local networks, where the self becomes an ensemble of relations” (p.305), reflecting Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) assertion that “in a postmodern perspective, there are multiple ways of knowing and multiple truths” (p.301).

Patton states that “keeping findings in context is a cardinal principal of qualitative analysis” (Patton, 2002, p.563), in order to acknowledge limitations of the situations studied and the selectivity of participants chosen for interviews or for document sampling, and identifies the importance of including negative cases in the process of data analysis. He feels that “dealing openly with the complexities and dilemmas posed by negative cases is... intellectually honest...” (p.555), and states that “where patterns and trends have been identified, our understanding of those patterns and trends is increased by considering the instances and cases that do not fit within the pattern” (p.554). According to Taylor (2006), “researchers need to struggle with the many perspectives and voices while acknowledging the contradictory tensions that often power the human experience” (p.7).

3.2.1 Social Constructivism/Constructionism

My goal was to generate information rich case studies in a social constructivist/constructionist frame. The social constructivist/constructionist perspective emphasizes “the social world . . . as socially, politically, and psychologically constructed” and offers “perspective and encourage(s) dialogue among perspectives rather than aiming at singular truth and linear prediction” (Patton, 2002, p.546). Michael Crotty (1998) makes a distinction between constructivism and constructionism, identifying the former as including “the meaning-making activity of the individual mind” and the latter to describe “the collective generation [and transmission] of meaning” (p.58).

Constructivism...points out the unique experience of each of us. It suggests that each one's way of making sense of the world is as valid and worthy of respect as any other... Social constructionism emphasizes the hold our culture has on us; it shapes the way in which we see things...and gives us a quite definite view of the world (Michael Crotty, 1998, p.58).

Patton (2002) acknowledges the ways in which constructivism and constructionism are integrated in practice, and for the purposes of this discussion, I will consider them as conflated components of the construction of the social world as reflecting both individual and collective perspectives.

Social constructivism/constructionism begins with the premise that “the human world is different from the natural, physical world, and must therefore be studied differently” (Patton, 2002, p.96), and rests on the thesis of “ontological relativity, which holds that all tenable statements about existence depend on a worldview, and no worldview is uniquely determined by empirical or sense data about the world” (Patton, 2002, pp.96-7). According to Guba and Lincoln (1990), humans have the capacity to interpret and construct reality, and according to Thomas’ Theorem, “What is defined and perceived by people as real is real in its consequences” (Thomas and Thomas, 1928, p.572).

Constructivists “study the multiple realities constructed by people and the implications of those constructions for their lives and interactions with others” (Patton, 2002, p.96), what Shadish (1995) calls “constructing *knowledge about* reality, not constructing reality itself” (p.67), in which the knowledge is “contextually embedded, interpersonally forged, and necessarily limited” (Neimeyer, 1993, pp.1-2). Guba and Lincoln (1989) identify as primary assumptions of constructivism the idea that “truth” is a matter of consensus among informed constructors, not of correspondence with objective reality, “facts” have no meaning except within some value framework, “causes” and effects can only be imputed, phenomena can only be understood within the context in which they’re studied, generalization between settings is not valid, and data derived from constructivist inquiry have no special legitimation, simply representing another

construction to be considered in the move toward consensus (pp.44-45). Further, constructivism/constructionism is relativistic in that knowledge is viewed as relative to time and space and “views dominant at any one time and place will serve the interests and perspectives of those who exercise the most power in a particular culture” (Patton, 2002, p.100).

Patton (2002) states that foundational questions guiding constructivist/constructionist inquiry are: “How have the people in this setting constructed reality? What are their reported perceptions, ‘truths’, explanations, beliefs, and world-view? What are the consequences of their constructions for their behaviors and for those with whom they interact” (p. 96)? He concludes that the basic contributions of social construction and constructivist perspectives to qualitative inquiry are

the emphasis on capturing and honoring multiple perspectives; attending to the ways in which language as a social and cultural construction shapes, distorts, and structures understandings; how methods determine findings; and the importance of thinking about the relationship between the investigator and the investigated, especially the effects of inequitable power dynamics- and how that relationship affects what is found (Patton, 2002, pp.102-103).

The focus of constructivist inquiry intersects well with my interest in the construction of ideologies and their impact in schools, particularly when paired with case study as a foundational methodology.

3.2.2 Case Study

The case study method allows investigators to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real life events (Yin, 2003, p.2).

Winston, discussing Lawrence Stenhouse's (1980) theories on the importance of educational research as an applied, rather than pure form of inquiry, states that research should "first and foremost, be useful, serving the purpose of educational improvement, of bettering practice through enhanced understanding" (p.42). Case study, "the study of the particularity and complexity of a single case, coming to understand its activity within important circumstances" (Stake, 1995, p.xi), or "deeply understanding specific cases within a particular context" (Patton, 2002, p.546), is a form that lends itself to educational drama research, as the methods of case study "can chime with the forms of knowledge generated by the art form of drama itself" (Winston, 2006, p.43). As in the development of educational drama experiences, "we craft our methodology to pursue our aims, evaluating and re-evaluating it, adapting and refining as we proceed" (Winston, 2002, p.45).

In case study, "thick, rich description provides the foundation for qualitative analysis and reporting" (Patton, 2002, p.437). Guided by sensitizing concepts, which "have played an important, preordinate role in guiding fieldwork, the data can be organized and described through those sensitizing concepts" (Patton, 2002, p.439). The challenge of describing complex, multi-relational, multi-level cases, even helped by the presence of sensitizing concepts and thick description, is substantial. Stake (1995) acknowledges that "it is true that in case study we deal with many complex phenomena and issues for which no consensus can be found as to what really exists- yet we have ethical obligations to minimize misrepresentation and misunderstanding" (p.108). Winston (2006) concurs that "issues of ethics and validity are central concerns to case study" (p.45) and points to the importance for case study researchers in pursuing "validity both in the

research process and in the way they present their findings” (Winston, 2006, p.46). He adds,

If we accept that all social knowledge is constructed, that meaning is necessarily interpretive, the tensions between description and explanation, observation and interpretation are at the heart of the meaning making processes in any research event. The case study approach is a suitable methodology for forefronting this awareness (Winston, 2006, p.46).

3.2.3 Grounded Theory

The grounded theory approach is the most influential paradigm for qualitative research in the social sciences today (Denzin, 1997, p.18).

Grounded Theory is a term used to describe a way of inducing theoretically based generalizations from qualitative data (Silverman, 2005, p.326).

My emphasis, in analyzing each case separately and in comparing the three components of the project, was on the development of grounded theory, the process of generating theory rather than researching a particular theoretical content. Grounded theory generally refers to “theory that is inductively generated from fieldwork, that is, theory that emerges from the researcher’s observations and interviews out in the real world rather than in the laboratory or academy” (Patton, 2002, p.11). With an “emphasis on inductive strategies of theory development in contrast to theory generated by logical deduction from a priori assumptions” (Patton, 2002, p.125), grounded theory begins with “basic description,” moves to “conceptual ordering,” and then theorizing (Patton, 2002, p.490). According to Strauss and Corbin (1998), “a theory is usually more than a

set of findings; it offers an explanation about phenomena” (p.22), and the development of grounded theory depends on methods, such as case study, “that take the researcher into and close to the real world so that the results and findings are grounded in the empirical world” (Patton, 2002, p.125).

Strauss and Corbin (1998) acknowledge that “in every piece of research- quantitative or qualitative- there is an element of subjectivity” (p.43). They state that “analysis is the interplay between researchers and data, so what grounded theory offers as a framework is a set of “coding procedures” which help qualitative analysts “consider alternative meanings of phenomenon” and emphasizes being “systematic and creative simultaneously” while elucidating the “building blocks of the theory” (ibid, p.13). Patton (2002) also reflects the need for balance between creativity and rigor, advising the researcher to “celebrate emergent understandings even while retaining the critical eye of the sceptic” (p.324).

In order to mitigate the effects of subjectivity, Strauss and Corbin (1998) advocate systematic rigor and researcher reflectivity from design through analysis, and thinking comparatively relative to both cases and theories, to help “control intrusion of bias into analysis while retaining sensitivity to what is being said in the data” (p.43). Further, Glaser and Strauss (1967) identify the importance of finding results that ‘fit’ and ‘work,’ explaining:

By ‘fit’ we mean that the categories must be readily (not forcibly) applicable to and indicated by the data under study; by ‘work’ we mean that they must be meaningfully relevant to and be able to explain the behavior under study (p.3).

I will discuss the coding categories I developed for each phase of my research, and my reasoning as I looked for a good ‘fit’ that ‘worked,’ later in the chapter. (For a sample of ‘cooked’ and coded data, see Appendix A, p. 338)

3.2.4 Inductive Analysis

The analysis of the data followed an inductive process, guided by my research questions and sensitizing concepts. According to Patton (2002),

qualitative inquiry is particularly oriented toward exploration, discovery, and inductive logic. Inductive analysis begins with specific observations and builds toward general patterns. Categories or dimensions of analysis emerge from open-ended observations as the inquirer comes to understand patterns that exist in the phenomenon being investigated...without presupposing in advance what the important dimensions will be (Patton, 2002, p.56).

Inductive analysis allows, even encourages, recognition of the “multiple interrelationships among dimensions that emerge from the data” (Patton, 2002, p.56).

Patton (2002) states that “the first task is to do a careful job independently writing up the separate cases” (p.57), followed by cross-case analysis in search of shared patterns and themes.

Once patterns, themes and/or categories have been established through inductive analysis, the final, confirmatory stage of qualitative analysis may be deductive in testing and affirming the authenticity and appropriateness of the inductive content analysis, including carefully examining deviate cases or data that don’t fit the categories developed (Patton, 2002, p.454).

In the case of my research, each component of the study suggested possible categories and themes that informed my content, coding categories and subsequent analysis. In addressing the raw data for each component and for a cross-case analysis, I employed coding procedures to help provide some “standardization and rigor” (Strauss and Corbin, 1998, p.13) to the analytical process, developing both open codes, “through which concepts are identified and their properties and dimensions discovered in data” (Strauss and Corbin, 1998, p.101) and axial codes, which relate “categories to their subcategories” (p.123).

I employed three forms of triangulation suggested by Stake (1995):

- 1) Investigator triangulation: inviting other investigators, in this case the outside ethnographer and classroom teacher, to look at the same event and share their perspectives in a systematic and on-going way.
- 2) Theory triangulation: actively seeking out different theories to explain what happened in the research events and coding the data in a variety of (sometimes opposing) categories (e.g. community and anti-community).
- 3) Methodological triangulation: using multiple approaches to data collection and analysis, including participant observation, interviews with participants, consulting relevant documentation, and member checking preliminary results with the goal of ensuring that interpretation is “supported and qualified by a range of data” (Winston, 2006, p.47).

I also pursued triangulation of sources as suggested by Patton (2002), checking the consistency of different data sources within the same method (interviewing multiple participants, for example) (p.556).

3.2.5 Critical Change Theory

Educational drama research has moved from a more general commitment to naturalistic inquiry and ethnographic approaches, to a study of action research, reflective practice, and classroom-based inquiry, to an interest in critical and emancipatory forms of scholarship, to more recent discussions of the post-modern condition and how interpretive acts are often aligned to the political (Taylor, 2006, p.1).

The design of this project also incorporates aspects of critical change theory (Brenner, 2006; Patton, 2002), in which qualitative inquiry is “a form of critical analysis aimed at social and political change,” approaching fieldwork and analysis with “an explicit agenda of elucidating power, economic, and social

inequalities” (Patton, 2002, p.548). “Those engaged in qualitative inquiry as a form of critical analysis aimed at social and political change...take an activist stance” (Patton, 2002, p.548) using research to “critique society, raise consciousness, and change the balance of power in favor of those less powerful” (ibid, p.548). In theory and practice, critical change theory reflects Freire’s (1993) philosophy of praxis and liberation education. Critical change theory “provides both philosophy and methods for approaching research and evaluation as fundamental and explicit manifestations of political praxis (connecting theory and action) and as change-oriented forms of engagement” which “build the capacity of those involved to better understand their own situations, raise consciousness, and support future action aimed at political change” (Patton, 2002, p.549).

The criteria defining this approach “flow from critical change theory, feminist inquiry, activist research, and participatory research processes aimed at empowerment” (Patton, 2002, p.543). They include: increasing consciousness about injustices; identifying the nature and sources of inequalities and injustices; representing the perspective of the less powerful; making visible the way those with more power exercise and benefit from power; engaging those with less power respectfully and collaboratively; building the capacity of those involved to take action; identifying potential change-making strategies; praxis; and a clear historical and values context. Critical change research often includes analysis that strives to provide an experience with the findings “where ‘truth’ or ‘reality’ is understood to have a *feeling dimension*...” (Patton, 2002, p.548). The description of and criteria for critical change theory above closely parallels the structures, praxis, and goals of the three-phase project I conducted.

3.3 Reflexive Practice for Researchers

As qualitative researchers, we understand that the researcher is a central figure who influences the collection, selection, and interpretation of data. Our behavior will always affect participants' responses, thereby influencing the direction of findings. Meanings are seen to be negotiated between researcher and researched within a particular social context so that another researcher in a different relationship will unfold a different story. Research is thus regarded as a joint product of the participants, the researcher, and their relationship: it is co-constituted. Furthermore, the qualitative research process itself has the potential to transform the very phenomenon being studied... (Finlay, 2002, p.531).

Finlay (2002) states that "it is vital for researchers to find ways to analyze how subjective and intersubjective elements influence their research. Reflexivity offers one such tool," transforming subjectivity "from a problem to an opportunity" (p.531). According to Finlay (2002), "reflexivity can be defined as thoughtful, conscious self-awareness" marked by the "continual evaluation of subjective responses, intersubjective dynamics, and the research process itself" in order to recognize "how we actively construct our knowledge" (p.532). "The reflexive ethnographer does not simply report 'facts' or 'truths' but actively constructs interpretations of his or her experiences in the field and then questions how those interpretations came about," having "an ongoing conversation about the experience while simultaneously living in the moment" (Hertz, 1997, p.viii).

Reflexivity is a tool to:

examine the impact of the position, perspective, and presence of the researcher; promote rich insight through examining personal responses and interpersonal dynamics; empower others by opening up a more radical consciousness; evaluate the research process, method, and outcomes; and enable public scrutiny of the integrity of the research through offering a methodological log of research decisions (Finlay, 2002, p.532).

Finlay distinguishes between reflection, which she characterizes as thinking about, and reflexivity, which she defines as “a more immediate, continuing, dynamic and subjective self-awareness” (p.533). Mauthner and Doucet (2003) state that “the importance of *being* reflexive is acknowledged within social science research and there is widespread recognition that the interpretation of data is a reflexive exercise through which meanings are made rather than found” (p.414), in which “knowledge and understanding are contextually and historically grounded, as well as linguistically constituted” (Mauthner & Doucet, 2003, p.416). They acknowledge that “as social researchers we are integral to the social world we study” (ibid, p.416), and Haraway (1988) describes the production of theory as a social activity, culturally, socially, and historically embedded, which results in situated knowledge.

“One area where sociological researchers have drawn links between epistemology and research practice concerns the research relationship” (Mauthner & Doucet, 2003, p.417), and they “stress the need to explore the dynamics of the researcher-researched relationship, which is seen to fundamentally shape research results” (Finlay, 2002, p.534). Theorists debate the extent to which similarities or differences between researcher and researched in characteristics such as gender, race, class and sexuality influence the nature and structure of research relationships (Song and Parker, 1995; Cotterill, 1992; Edwards, 1990; Ribbens, 1989), and, by extension, outcomes and analysis. Mauthner and Doucet (2003) point to the importance of “recognizing the social location of the researcher as well as the ways in which our emotional responses to respondents can shape our interpretations of their accounts” (p.418). They add,

there is a tendency to simplify the complex processes of representing the ‘voices’ of respondents as though these voices speak on their own, rather

than through the researcher who makes choices about how to interpret these voices and which transcript extracts to present as evidence (Mauthner and Doucet, 2003, p.418).

Wasserfall (1997) states that “the use of reflexivity during fieldwork can mute the distance and alienation built into conventional notions of ‘objectivity’ ... The research process becomes more mutual...” (p.152). However, the distinction between the observing and the observed is problematized by Jorgenson, (1991) given the “emerging relatedness in the interview situation as each observes the other observing” (p.210). Beer (1997) comments on this dynamic as well, stating: “Interviews augment experience, rather than simply reflecting it. They alter meaning, instead of delineating it. They change people” (p.127). While I agree that these dynamics are in play, in my opinion this level of reflexivity and ‘other’ awareness risks problematizing the research experience to the point of practical paralysis.

Finlay, (2002) states that “being preoccupied by one’s own emotions and experiences, however, can skew findings in undesirable directions” (p.536), and adds that “we need to strike a balance, striving for enhanced self-awareness but eschewing navel-gazing” (ibid, p.536). She continues, “If the researcher is sincere in maintaining a primary focus on the participants or texts involved, returning to the self only as a part of increasing awareness and insight, the problem of regress is bypassed” (p.542). I agree, and consider the value of Kvale’s (1996) emphasis on the importance of the researcher’s “moral integrity” as “critical for evaluation of the quality of scientific knowledge produced” (pp.241-242).

3.3.1 Teaching, Critical Change Theory, and Reflectivity

In order to be effective the reflective practitioner strives to be self-knowing as well as other knowing. To dig deep into self in order to bring

into consciousness, the otherwise unconscious instincts, habits, values and learnt behaviours that shape their practice... (Neelands, 2006, p.17).

Neelands (2006) identifies the importance of reflectivity for teachers as well as researchers, particularly as educational drama increasingly reflects a dynamic in which “teaching is research and research is practice” (p.25). Freire (1998), states that

in the context of true learning, the learners will be engaged in a continuous transformation through which they become authentic subjects of the construction and reconstruction of what is being taught, side by side with the teacher, who is equally subject to the same process (p.33).

Consequently, according to Neelands (2006), both teachers and learners should be “made aware of knowledge as an interactive process which is selective, produced and constructed between teachers and learners” (p.21) in which “knowledge and its selection are neither neutral nor innocent” (p.23).

For critical theorists, reflective practice is an emancipatory project... which seeks to empower teachers as agents of social change engaged in a process of first exposing and then, through their own politicization and agency, moving from an authoritarian and elitist model of schooling towards a social democratic model (Neelands, 2006, p.23-4).

The goal of reflective practice then is to “problematise the curriculum in terms of what and whose knowledge is valued and in terms of how inclusive and equitable the curriculum is for students who do not belong to the culture of power” (Neelands, 2006, p.25), in order to “equip students both with the knowledge needed to be powerful and a critical consciousness of how power operates...” (ibid, p.25).

If, as Neelands (2006) states, “in critical theory there is the assumption that what we see is what *we* see” (p.33) and the purpose of reflective practice in an emancipatory model is to “try and establish shared understandings or truth claims” (p.33), then research practice in educational drama, from project design to final

analysis, requires “constant questioning and testing of the common sense assumptions and other interpretations underpinning the pedagogic and epistemological dimensions of learning” (Neelands, 2006, p.22). Britzman (1991) identifies the conflation of theory and practice: “The act of theorizing is not an imposition of abstract theories upon vacuous conditions. Theorising is a form of engagement with and intervention in the world. Theory always lives in the practical experiences of us all...” (p.55).

3.3.2 My Orientation

When we live our lives with the authenticity demanded by the practice of teaching that is also learning and learning that is also teaching, we are participating in a total experience that is simultaneously directive, political, ideological, gnostic, pedagogical, aesthetic, and ethical. In this experience the beautiful, the decent, and the serious form a circle with hands joined (Freire, 1998, pp.31-2).

In considering my own position, I am drawn to constructions offered by phenomenologists, such as Heidegger (1962), who recommend looking inward for the sources of subjectivity and difference, and to those embraced by social constructionists, who recommend looking outward at interactions and discourse. Phenomenologists “focus on the way subject and object are enmeshed in pre-reflective existence” (Finlay, 2002, p.534) and emphasize the importance of the researcher’s understanding of her own existence before interpreting the subject’s, arguing that “each person will perceive the same phenomenon in a different way; each person brings to bear his or her lived experience, specific understandings, and historical background” (ibid, p.534). Phenomenologists seek to “embrace their own humanness as the basis for psychological understanding” (Walsh, 1995, p.335), while “social constructionists argue against taking an inward approach to subjectivity, in which individuals look into themselves...Instead, they invite the researcher to look outward into the realm of interaction, discourse, and shared

meanings” (Finlay, 2002, p.534). DeVault (1997) states, “I sometimes worry that the recent emphasis on the personal may signal a retreat from the attempt to interpret a wider social world” (p.225). I agree; I think you need to do both.

When I conducted the project, I was 52 years old. I’m a Harvard-educated, white, middle class female, and my research was conducted with low-income students of color in an urban environment. Borrowing from the participative approach (Finlay, 2002), I acknowledge the tensions that arise from my different social position relative to class and race, and the wide divide between the students’ lived experiences and my own. In the socio-economic and cultural terms advocated by social constructivists, we have little in common and creating a shared ‘truth’ regarding the research outcomes presents quite a challenge. How could I hope to understand the complexity of their experiences, or interpret their discourse and actions with any sense of confidence in the validity of my findings?

However, in the phenomenological construction, I have something to bring to the table. I have worked with students of color in urban environments for 20 years, using in-role and process drama as a tool for facilitating curriculum acquisition and helping students develop critical and creative thinking skills. The nature of the work I did, in which I was simultaneously training the classroom teacher in the use of the drama form and working with groups of students, gave me substantial experience with urban students and teachers of color. I learned three important lessons through this work: 1) Students often want you to know about their lives. They bring the relationships that are important to them, the challenges they face, and their values into the drama lessons, and they are often happy to share them with you if you’re interested in knowing; 2) Both students and teacher can be surprised by the aspects of shared humanity (Walsh, 1995) that

come up regularly in drama work; 3) You only know a tiny piece of any student's life, and the things you don't know are often startling, and call into question everything you thought you did know. (I am remembering a 14 year old named Aldo who was brilliant as a prosecutor during drama-based mock trial. I later found out that this was his first and *only* successful school experience, and that he was considered a danger to other students.)

I am an observer of others. I understand the world through my interpersonal understandings and my ability to place those understandings in wider contexts, as the dynamics that exist between individuals are reflected and amplified at the level of society and demonstrated in our cultural, ethical, political, and socio-economic systems. I am driven to try to make the world a fairer place, in which race, class, and color do not determine success or failure. And I'm a teacher, so I work for this change with students in schools. My teaching philosophy reflects Kinchloe's (1991) emancipatory model: "action based on reflection with the intention of serving an emancipatory interest" (Neelands, 2006, p.24), striving "towards a more inclusive, and therefore ethical, model of schooling" characterized by "open dialogue, negotiation and the fostering of critical thinking and action amongst the community of learners and teachers..." (ibid, p.37).

Mauthner & Doucet (2003) "suggest that subjects are reflexively constituted between the researcher and the researched, and that while they are therefore always incompletely unknown, it is possible to grasp something of their articulated experience and subjectivity through a research encounter" (p.423). Careful observation, a strict adherence to accepted methodologies in qualitative research in data collection and analysis, and the awareness of what you can and

can't know about others' realities are foundational to achieving some understanding of what it was *you* were seeing, through your perspective and theirs. Neelands (2006) adds, "through creating a radical praxis based on research" which relies on carefully gathered material and theoretical evidence, "including self-criticism and ideology critique, teaching is seen as one important way in which we can intervene in the world and act for a more equitable and democratic society" (Neelands, 2006, p.36). I believe this is true.

3.4 The Road Not Taken

A critical social theory is concerned in particular with issues of power and justice and the ways that economy, matters of race, class, and gender, ideologies, discourses, education, religion and other social institutions and cultural dynamics interact to construct a social system... Inquiry that aspires to the name *critical* must be connected to an attempt to confront the injustice of a particular society... Research thus becomes a transformative endeavor unembarrassed by the label *political* and unafraid to consummate a relationship with emancipatory consciousness (Kinchloe and McLaren, 2000, pp.281, 291).

Kinchloe and McLaren (2000) argue that "no pristine interpretation exists, no methodology, social or educational theory, or discursive form can claim a privileged position that enables the production of authoritative knowledge" (p.286), and Bochner (2002) states that "no single, unchallenged paradigm has been established for deciding what does and does not comprise valid, useful, and significant knowledge... there is no one right way to do social science research" (p.259). He adds, "it is impossible to fix a single standard for deciding the good and right purposes, forms, and practices of ethnography" and states that "alternative ethnography reflects a desire to do meaningful, significant, and valuable work" (ibid, p.260). Citing Geertz (1980), he advocates alternative

ethnographies in which investigators are “liberated to shape their work in terms of its own necessities rather than according to received ideas about what must be done” and states that “we should never insist on reaching agreement beforehand on the criteria to which all arguments, reasoning, and conclusions must appeal” (p.261). Finally, he argues that “criteria are not found, they are made,” (p.261) and are social products created by human beings in evolving a set of practices to which we then agree to conform.

I chose to utilize qualitative inquiry using participant observation, in an information-rich case study approach, in a social constructivist/constructionist frame, with an emphasis on critical change theory. There are other forms of qualitative research that successfully address the complexity of educational drama research, and several offer similar or complimentary perspectives to the methods I employed. Critical ethnography, for example, in which “the ideological nature of knowledge resides in the embeddedness of commonsense knowledge and social science knowledge in political and economic interests” (Gallagher, 2006, p.65) shares an interest in understanding events in their wider social context with an eye to promoting social change. Feminist methodologies offer interesting perspectives on the role of the researcher as a male-centric construction, and I am particularly interested in Oakley’s (1981) work on feminist interviewing, in which “personal involvement is more than just dangerous bias- it is the condition under which people come to know each other and to admit others into their lives” (p.58). Oakley (1981) states that there can be “no intimacy without reciprocity” (p.41). She suggests that we need to dismantle unequal power dynamics in our research as “the goal of finding out about people through interviewing is best achieved when the relationship of interviewer and interviewee is non-hierarchical and when

the interviewer is prepared to invest his or her own personal identity in the relationship” (Oakley, 1981, p.41). I find this resonant with my understanding of people.

Bacon’s (2006) work on performance ethnography, which theorizes that performance can “best be understood through the use of participant observation, wherein the researcher uses her own knowledge of the discipline to assist in her research” (p.154), speaks to the importance of the role of the teaching-artist-as-researcher in shaping research data, as does its aim “to value the experience of both researcher and researched within a creative environment such as the applied arts” (ibid, p.135). However, as a teaching artist, my orientation is always on the side of considering the aesthetic as serving an educational objective rather than the aesthetic *as* a central learning outcome. Other methodologies, such as narrative inquiry, based on the “ways in which narrative provides a means of making sense of one’s own experiences” (Zatzman, 2006, p.111), feels too self-referencing for my taste. I am most aligned with Grady (2006), who identifies her own orientation to research as “largely informed by a humanities perspective with an emphasis on employing an assortment of critical theories to interpret and analyse how applied drama and theatre ‘work’ in various contexts” (p.83).

Ultimately I chose to utilize the methodologies I did because they are effective for addressing the complexities of educational drama research; they allow me to consider the social, cultural, political, and economic roots of individual behavior; and they allow me to work for change as I strive to make sense of inequity, for the students and myself. I am drawn to the inductive process of grounded theory because that’s the way my mind works; I am less interested in disproving or proving existing theory than I am in trying to create a

path towards possible positive change, tiny and insignificant though it may be.

And, if I'm going to commit hundreds of hours of work to an effort, I want to try to budge the gigantic boulder of unequal power and inequitable outcomes while I'm doing it, because that's what I care about.

Why does the researcher trust what he knows?... They are his perceptions, his personal experiences, and his own hard-won analysis. A field worker knows that he knows, not only because he has been in the field and because he has carefully discovered and generated hypotheses, but also because "in his bones" he feels the worth of his final analysis (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, pp.224-25).

3.5 Methods

3.5.1 Data Collection

In each phase of the project I was a participant observer, though to varying degrees in different components of the study. I'll address each component separately below. Cohen and Manion (1980) identify the advantages of participant observation in case study research, as it allows for gathering of both verbal and non-verbal data, allows the investigator to note behavior in real time as it emerges, and enables the researcher to develop a more intimate and informal relationship with research participants (pp.103-104). According to Winston (2006), "It is flexible and less reactive to more structured data gathering methods, where unnoticed bias can remain unaddressed through the very rigidity of the research design" (p.48).

I took time after each session to go over my notes and generate out-of-field notes that expanded on dynamics I'd observed during the lesson while events were still fresh in my mind.

3.5.2 Interviews

In both the Preliminary Study and Phase Two: Playmaking, observation and data collection during the drama interventions were followed by ethnographic interviews in a standardized, open-ended format “to understand the shared experiences, practices, and beliefs that arise from shared cultural perspectives” (Brenner, 2006, p.358). According to Patton (2002), we interview people to “find out from them those things we cannot directly observe” (p.340), such as thoughts, feelings and intentions, in an effort to more fully understand “how people have organized the world and the meanings they attach to what goes on in the world” (p.341). Cohen, Manion, and Morrisson (2007) add that “the more the project addresses intangible and unmeasurable elements, and the richer the data that are to be collected, the more there is a need for increased and sensitive interpersonal behaviour, face-to-face data collection and qualitative data” (p.97).

In the interviews I conducted during my research, I utilized an interview guide listing questions to be explored during the interview and informed by sensitizing concepts, but allowed for “flexibility, spontaneity, and responsiveness to individual differences” (Patton, 2002, p.343) in pursuing “subjects of interest” (p.347) suggested by participant responses.

Patton (2002) warns that combining conversational and guide-based interviewing can result in more information being collected from one subject than another, influencing findings due to the differences in the depth and breadth of information received from different people. This was an issue in the interviews I conducted, as they were affected by the students’ comfort in talking to me, facility with the English language, and general verbal orientation. I will discuss this factor in more detail in discussing each phase of the project. However I found the

interviews helpful in capturing “how those being interviewed view their world, to learn *their* terminology and judgements, and to capture the complexities of *their* individual perceptions and experiences” (Patton, 2002, p.348).

3.5.3 Obtaining Access and Consent

I selected Chelsea High School (CHS) as the site for my research for several reasons. First, as a low income urban system with a multi-ethnic, multi-racial, multi-cultural population, it provided me with the student population in which I was interested. Students attending CHS experience most of the challenges facing the urban poor in the US: high rates of teen pregnancy, attendance issues, gangs, and very high rates of school failure and drop out. (In 2009, the year in which I conducted Phases One and Two of the project, the graduation rate from CHS was 54%, and the school was at risk of being taken over by the state for failure to meet expected pass rates on standardized tests.) Second, it has a full-time theatre and dance program that includes several levels of available courses, from beginner to more advanced (though students required to complete an Arts course in order to graduate are often randomly assigned to the various class levels, with no regard for their previous skills or knowledge), and offers both coursework and after school performance components. Finally, I know and respect Amy, the theatre and dance teacher, who had been my student in the graduate theatre education program at Emerson College. Having visited and observed in her classes in other professional contexts, I was aware of her aesthetic, her emphasis on the establishment of the drama classroom as a ‘safe space’ for students, and her focus on drama as a tool to facilitate the students’ development of life skills. Amy was interested in learning more about how to use process drama and playmaking with her students from me, and during the project I

modeled those skills for her. Finally, her positive relationship with the school principal, and his trust in her judgement, allowed me to obtain permission to conduct research at CHS on the strength of a handshake and a description of what I planned to do. This stands in stark contrast to the experience of others in the research methods class I took. One woman waited 5 months to gain research access to a Boston Public School at which she was *employed* as a teacher. My preliminary project was approved by the Human Subjects Review Board at Harvard Graduate School of Education. Phases One and Two of my research were approved by the Ethical Review Board, and I adhered to the BERA Ethical Guidelines for Research. Due to the age of the participants, the use of parental consent forms, in which the full extent of the project and their child's participation in it is detailed, was required for participation in the project (see Appendix B, p.345). Students over 18 years of age were allowed to sign their own consent forms.

3.6 The Preliminary Study

The original intent of the preliminary study was to provide foundational data on urban students' understandings of power. The research questions guiding this study were:

- How do urban students of color understand the effect of power dynamics on their lives? What meanings do these words hold for them?
- Are they articulating the same level of knowledge verbally as they do in performance?
- How do students view the connection between community and power?

This data informed the wider study examining the use of applied theatre/drama for facilitating students' understandings of power on a societal level and development of strategies for wielding power effectively in self-advocacy efforts.

Table 3.1 (p.95-7) identifies the research questions, conceptual goals, data collection and analysis strategies, and potential evidence which framed this phase of my research.

3.6.1 Preliminary Study Design

The preliminary study was conducted on November 15, 2007, with 19 students of mixed ages and races in a Drama 2 class in a low-income urban high school outside of Boston, MA. This group was selected because they were very tight-knit and demonstrated a high degree of trust in each other and their teacher, which resulted in risk-taking in scene work.

I initially planned to observe a drama class that focused on issues of power and to conduct follow-up interviews with one or two students in order to further explore their ideas as depicted in the performance/theatre work. I co-planned the lesson with Amy, the classroom teacher. It was structured loosely around the work of Augusto Boal, incorporating several different types of performance opportunities within the same lesson- exercises, tableaux, and scene work. The final scene work was based on personal stories of power situations from their lives, and allowed me to glimpse areas that might provide rich interview data. Amy taught the lesson, and I observed and took notes, sitting on the stage very close to the students in order to hear, and moving among them as they planned, maintaining as much discretion as possible.

Table 3.1

Analytic Question Matrix

What do I need to know?	Why do I need to know this?	What kind of data will answer the questions?	Where can I find the data?	How will I analyze the data?	What kinds of evidence will this produce?
How do urban students of color understand the effect of power dynamics on their lives? What meanings do these words hold for them?					
<p>How do students define power?</p> <p>Where do students see power demonstrated in their daily lives?</p> <p>How do power dynamics affect them in school, at home, at work, in the world?</p>	<p>Student constructions of what constitutes power helps inform my understanding of how they define it—an active definition.</p> <p>Student constructions of their own positions of power/powerlessness in various life situations informs my understanding of their awareness of individual and socialized power dynamics.</p>	<p>Student self-report, story, clarifications of their scene work in Boal drama class</p>	<p>Transcripts of semi-structured interviews.</p> <p>Field notes of class observation</p>	<p>Inductive analysis: Identification of key themes and patterns as well as contrasts and paradoxes</p>	<p>Information-rich case studies of individual students, possibly some patterns of similarity and difference between participants</p>

What do I need to know?	Why do I need to know this?	What kind of data will answer the questions?	Where can I find the data?	How will I analyze the data?	What kinds of evidence will this produce?
Are they articulating the same level of knowledge verbally as they do in performance?					
Can students talk about the same dynamics that are embedded in their depictions/performances in theatre? Are they consciously aware of everything they're showing in scene work?	<p>Observation of the world and inferential, unconscious reflections of those observations are present in the students' performance work. Which are conscious and intentional, which are not? Do they intellectually understand everything they're reflecting?</p> <p>As a starting point for expanding their awareness of power dynamics, I need to know what they already understand.</p>	<p>Contrast between their performance "stories" and their spoken stories.</p> <p>Their relative sophistication in discussing the power dynamics they perceive in their own lives, in comparison with their multi-layered performances.</p>	<p>Transcripts of semi-structured interviews.</p> <p>Field notes of class observation</p>	<p>Identification of power dynamics elements in scene work</p> <p>Identification of power dynamics elements in interviews</p> <p>Inductive analysis: Identification of key themes and patterns as well as contrasts and paradoxes</p>	<p>a) Identification of power representations in performance</p> <p>b) Identification of student awareness of power as a life element</p> <p>c) Interpretation of students understandings as presented through performance and interview</p>

What do I need to know?	Why do I need to know this?	What kind of data will answer the questions?	Where can I find the data?	How will I analyze the data?	What kinds of evidence will this produce?
How do students view the connection between community and power?					
<p>Are students aware of the power that they demonstrate as a community?</p> <p>Can they name the value that community holds for them in this class?</p>	<p>Literature on Sense of Community and its connection to power is clear. Do they experience it the way that it's described in the literature? If not, why does it look the way it does? If so, their descriptions/discussion can add to an understanding of urban students of color in relationship to community and power.</p>	<p>Student self-report, body language, explanation of observed classroom dynamics in interview, identification of community in other areas of their lives.</p>	<p>Transcripts of semi-structured interviews.</p> <p>Field notes of class observations.</p>	<p>Identification of community and power elements in interviews</p> <p>Identification of community and power elements in observations</p> <p>Inductive analysis: Identification of key themes and patterns as well as contrasts and paradoxes</p>	<p>a) Identifications of community and power representations in performance and body language.</p> <p>b) Identification of student awareness of community and power as a life element</p> <p>c) Interpretations of students' understandings as presented through performance and in interview.</p>

SOURCE: Adapted by David Eddy Spicer from *Ethnography and Qualitative Design in Educational Research* (2nd ed.) by M. D. LeCompte and J. Preissle, 1993, San Diego: Academic Press as cited in *Qualitative Research Design* (2nd ed.) by J. Maxwell, 2005, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, p. 100-101.

3.6.2 Preliminary Study Interviews

My initial plan was to conduct an interview with one or two class members, but subsequently many of the participants asked to be interviewed. My initial interview, on November 19, 2007, with a senior girl named Edia, generated such a wealth of helpful data that I ultimately interviewed eleven students, 6 boys (Ricky, Michael, Carlos, Anthony, Jimmy, and John) and 5 girls (Edia, Angelica, Yesenia, Katelyn, and Jazzmin). (At their request, I am using their first names rather than pseudonyms in this paper.) I interviewed Ricky, Angelica, and Michael in individual interviews and the others in two single-gender small groups on January 7, 8, and 9, 2008. The students represented a cross-section of the class, racially, academically, and socially. The interview questions reflected both my broader interest in their constructions and understandings of power and my emerging interest in the power I'd observed in their community (for full text of interview guide, see Appendix p. 347). I audio recorded their interviews and transcribed them, or had them transcribed, in their entirety.

3.6.3 Coding Categories

I identified codes relative to the research questions guiding the preliminary study and suggested by the data from my observations and interviews. Open codes are identified in bold font and are followed by axial codes which are related to them.

Power as Control- internal and external

Power and status

Choice

Positive uses of power

Negative Uses of Power

Having power- feelings and expressions of power- positive and negative

Not having power**School****Family**

Power and love

Power Styles

Overt demonstrations of power

Passive/neutral demonstrations of power

Locations/manifestations of Power-

Money and power

Physicality as power

Strength and size

Sex

The right to be yourself as power- control of you

Choice as power

Honesty as a power position

Lies as power-taking

Competence as power

Community as power

Emotional Responses to Power

Anger

Fear

Gratitude

Irritation

Acceptance

Anti-Community

3.6.4 Lessons Learned

I learned several important lessons in conducting data collection and analysis during the preliminary study. First, I was unprepared for the range of reactions to my presence onstage, as I listened to the students plan. Some students were unconcerned by my proximity as they discussed deeply personal stories of discrimination and power, even making eye contact or inviting me to comment, while others clearly found my presence disruptive and stopped talking until I moved away. Given the acoustics of the auditorium and stage, maintaining a respectful distance was not an option. I realized that in order to generate “thick, rich description” (Patton, 2002, p.437) during the process drama work, I would need to be more a part of things, more familiar, in order not to be disruptive when I got near the students during scene work. I felt I needed to develop the “more intimate and informal relationship” identified by Cohen and Manion (1980, p.103) in order to most effectively gather data. As a result, I led some warm-ups and games with the students in Phase One before they started the process drama work, (even though Amy would be leading the class), and occasionally took on role or facilitated scene development during the drama work itself. While it didn’t eliminate the problem, it seemed to mitigate it, or perhaps it was simply a result of my presence with them over the substantially longer period of time (12 class periods) during which the process drama work was conducted.

Second, I realized the impossibility of obtaining a representative sampling of what was happening without more eyes and ears on the task, (as students frequently spread out around the auditorium while planning and rehearsing work), and the inevitable subjectivity that would result from my increased intimacy with the students. I decided to provide investigator triangulation (Stake, 1995) by employing an outside ethnographer familiar with the forms of applied theatre/drama used. Bevin, the

ethnographer, has a B.A. in theatre education, a background in process drama and playmaking, and types 90 words a minute. She was invaluable. Intuitive, interpersonally skilled and with a background in teaching urban high school students of color, she would be able to generate ideas about what she was seeing and recording. She “cooked” her data after each session and sent both raw and cooked data to me within 48 hours. I went over both sets of data, integrated them and generated additional interpretations based on Bevin’s raw and cooked data. I also realized that I would need to confer with Amy after each class in order to get her interpretation of events. I asked her to reflect in a general way on how the class had gone and asked her to identify moments/events/elements that stood out for her. As she taught 5 classes a day, immediate feedback was necessary if I wanted detail. I also met with her regularly (daily or weekly) during the longer components of the process drama and playmaking work to reflect on where the lesson had gone and where it needed to go.

Third, as a requirement of the Research Methods class I took, I conducted and transcribed a 45 minute interview with Edia, a senior girl. In transcribing the interview, I realized that my habit of saying “yes” when she paused was taken as an indication that I understood her point. She’d then nod at me and wait for the next question. Aside from the need to change my interviewing technique, which I did, this made me reflect on the way in which an assumption of shared understanding cuts two ways—my assumption that I understood what Edia meant in spite of our widely different social and cultural locations, and *her* equally problematic assumption that I understood what she said, which caused her to abbreviate her answers and explanations. This reflects Kershaw’s (1992) concern regarding the possibility that culturally interventionist theatre may result in “ideological identification” (p.245)

between the practitioners and community of location that represents “a reinforcement of achieved commonalities” (p.245) that may or may not work against the status quo, and Finlay’s (2002) warning against assuming shared language and understandings, lest one miss “the point that there were differences” (p.537). It made the construction of even a qualified, site-specific, case-specific version of ‘truth’ difficult to achieve. As a result, I decided to add member checks of my early results to both subsequent phases of the project as an additional form of triangulation.

Finally, the results of the preliminary study suggested an interaction between community and power for the students in the study. Consequently, I added a research question to both Phase One and Two which addressed this dynamic.

3.7 Phase One Design

Phase One of my research utilized process drama as an approach to teaching U.S. labor history and collective action, past and present. The key questions guiding this phase of the research were:

- What are the effects of process drama on facilitating students’ understandings of unequal power dynamics, as reflected in cultural hegemony and unequal distribution of resources in their lives?
- What are the effects of integrating social and labor history with contemporary themes in creating a context for understanding current unequal power dynamics?
- In what ways can teaching labor history from the past affect students’ constructions of collective action in the present?
- In what ways does the community established in the drama classroom affect students’ engagement and facility with the material?

Table 3.2 (see p.104-107) identifies the research questions, conceptual goals, data collection and analysis strategies, and potential evidence which framed this phase of my research.

Phase One was conducted from October 16- November 8, 2008 with a Drama 1 class of 24 students of mixed ages and ethnicities. The degree of theatre knowledge and experience among the students varied substantially, as did their range of academic capabilities and their facility with English. I observed the students for three class periods before introducing them to the project. During this period, I was introduced to them, learned their names, and watched a series of classes which included games, tableaux, and scenes about power. The subject of these scenes indicated some of their thinking/conceptualizing about power. I also observed their facility with drama forms, their social dynamics, their relationship to the teacher, Amy, and their commitment to the class. I selected F Block for the project because they demonstrated a strong sense of community, a positive relationship with Amy, and a range of drama/theatre knowledge and capability. I designed a series of process dramas that Amy taught over 12 class periods. As stated above, I was a participant observer during the drama work--I led some warm-ups and games on the first day and occasionally took on role or facilitated scene development in subsequent classes. I took notes throughout the lessons, as did Bevin.

I also observed and worked with D Block, a class of 25 students of mixed ages and ethnicities. The D Block class had more underclasspersons than F Block, and the leadership was socially-based, rather than competence-based. I led the process drama classes with D Block, and Amy observed and facilitated, occasionally taking role and helping students with scene development. My modeling of the process drama structures and techniques was designed to facilitate Amy's comfort in taking

Table 3.2

Analytic Question Matrix

What do I need to know?	Why do I need to know this?	What kind of data will answer the questions?	Where can I find the data?	How will I analyze the data?	What kinds of evidence will this produce?
What are the effects of process drama on facilitating students' understandings of unequal power dynamics, as reflected in cultural hegemony and unequal distribution of resources in their lives?					
<p>What do students currently understand about personal and social power?</p> <p>How much do students understand about cultural hegemony and unequal distribution of wealth as factors in power distribution and ownership?</p> <p>In what ways does process drama allow students to develop their understandings of these dynamics in action?</p>	<p>Student constructions of what constitutes power helps inform my understanding of how much they understand about the parallels between micro (personal) and macro (societal) power situations/structures.</p> <p>Student constructions of the place of money and cultural capital indicates for me their understanding of societal tools for maintaining the control and distribution of power.</p> <p>The first step toward possible change is in understanding the dynamics in play. If process drama can be used for this purpose, to motivate and facilitate understanding, it is a boon for students and for the field.</p>	<p>Student self-report, performance, story development in the dramas, argument/advocacy within the dramas</p>	<p>Pre-project survey results</p> <p>Post-project survey results</p> <p>Field notes of class observation</p> <p>Ethnographer notes of class observations</p>	<p>Inductive analysis: Identification of key themes and patterns as well as contrasts and paradoxes</p>	<p>Information-rich case studies of individual students and of group dynamics, patterns of similarity and difference between participants, some indicators of change over time</p>

What do I need to know?	Why do I need to know this?	What kind of data will answer the questions?	Where can I find the data?	How will I analyze the data?	What kinds of evidence will this produce?
What are the effects of integrating social and labor history with contemporary themes in creating a context for understanding current unequal power dynamics?					
<p>To what extent can students draw parallels between social/labor history and current day dynamics, as pertains to unequal power distribution?</p> <p>To what extent do students identify the role of immigrants (and cultural hegemony) as central to these dynamics?</p>	<p>The unequal power dynamics of today have existed before, and non-dominant peoples have made substantial changes through collective action. If the students can draw these parallels, they may be able to imagine themselves in the role as change agents.</p> <p>Can they see themselves and their families in the stories of labor history?</p>	<p>Students' reflection of their own lived power and cultural dynamics in scenes they create about the past</p> <p>Reflections of the past in scenes they create about their own lives</p> <p>Students' ability to identify and discuss the parallels</p> <p>Students' application of ideas/problems/solutions between past and present</p>	<p>Pre-project survey results</p> <p>Post-project survey results</p> <p>Field notes of class observation</p> <p>Ethnographer notes of class observations</p>	<p>Identification of power and cultural dynamics' parallels in scene work</p> <p>Identification of power and cultural dynamics' parallels in survey results</p> <p>Inductive analysis: Identification of key themes and patterns as well as contrasts and paradoxes</p>	<p>a) Identification of student awareness of parallels between social/labor history dynamics and present day dynamics re: unequal power</p> <p>b) Identification of student awareness of culture and immigrant status as a factor in unequal power dynamics</p> <p>c) Interpretation of students' understandings as presented through performance and in surveys</p>

What do I need to know?	Why do I need to know this?	What kind of data will answer the questions?	Where can I find the data?	How will I analyze the data?	What kinds of evidence will this produce?
In what ways can teaching the past affect students' constructions of collective action in the present?					
To what extent can they see the possibilities for collective action as a tool for positive change today?	Collective action is a viable tool for fostering social change, possibly the only one readily available to them. If they're willing to consider the possibility that they <i>could</i> use it, it might be possible to use process drama and playmaking to teach them <i>how</i> to use it.	Student self-report, body language, performances in process dramas about collective action, arguments for and against collective action within the dramas, post-drama processing/discussion.	Pre-project survey results Post-project survey results Field notes of class observations. Ethnographer notes of class observations	Identification of collective action elements in observations, surveys Inductive analysis: Identification of key themes and patterns as well as contrasts and paradoxes	a) Interpretations of students' understandings as presented through performance and in surveys.

What do I need to know?	Why do I need to know this?	What kind of data will answer the questions?	Where can I find the data?	How will I analyze the data?	What kinds of evidence will this produce?
In what ways does the community established in the drama classroom affect students' engagement and facility with the material?					
<p>Are students aware of the power that they demonstrate as a community?</p> <p>Can they identify ways that their community-based power could be used to make change in unequal power dynamics?</p>	<p>Literature on Sense of Community and its connection to power is clear. Do they experience it the way that it's described in the literature? If so, their descriptions/discussion can add to an understanding of urban students of color in relationship to community and power.</p>	<p>Student self-report, body language, performances in process dramas, engagement in class time, positive peer interactions, use of optional "sick days", post-drama processing/discussion.</p>	<p>Pre-project survey results</p> <p>Post-project survey results</p> <p>Field notes of class observations.</p> <p>Ethnographer notes of class observations</p>	<p>Identification of community and power elements in surveys</p> <p>Identification of community and power elements in observations</p>	<p>a) Identifications of community and power representations in performance and body language.</p> <p>b) Identification of student awareness of community and power as an element in labor history and in the present</p>

SOURCE: Adapted by David Eddy Spicer from *Ethnography and Qualitative Design in Educational Research* (2nd ed.) by M. D. LeCompte and J. Preissle, 1993, San Diego: Academic Press as cited in *Qualitative Research Design* (2nd ed.) by J. Maxwell, 2005, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, p. 100-101.

leadership with the F Block class, and meet her stated goal of achieving competence leading process drama work. I coded all of the data for both classes, but ultimately decided to work just with the F Block data for the following reasons:

1. As in the preliminary study, I was interested in removing myself from the equation as much as possible in determining the outcomes of the work. I planned and modeled the lessons, but my serving as primary teacher seemed to change the focus of inquiry too much, from “What are the effects of process drama...?” to “What are the effects of *my teaching* process drama...?” I’m a teaching artist with 20 years of experience using this form of applied drama. I was more interested in considering the effects of the form and content in less experienced hands.
2. As a teacher, I foster discussion; that is my skill and interest. Amy is much less discussion-oriented; she likes action. Consequently, I often asked twice as many questions as she did in processing the work we’d just done. I felt that, if students reflected the understandings of cultural hegemony and unequal distribution of resources in their lives in the brief discussions fostered by Amy, that was a stronger indication of their learning than in my longer, multi-question discussions.
3. As lead teacher, my field notes for D Block were much less complete than those for F Block, in which I was constantly observing and recording. Bevin provided ethnography for 8 of the 12 D Block sessions, and I dedicated time after each class period to record my memory of events. Consequently the quotes, questions, and details on scene development are less complete in the D Block data.

3.7.1 Survey

In Phase One: Process Drama, observation and data collection during the drama interventions were preceded and followed by the application of a survey instrument, and a final discussion/reflection conducted with the group.

I designed the survey/questionnaire as an “informal survey” (Casley and Kumar, 1987; Casley and Lury, 1982) which was conducted before the start of the process drama work. According to Marsland, Wilson, Abeyasekera, and Kleih (n.d.),

in some cases, researchers and practitioners may conduct a questionnaire survey before a more in-depth informal study. In such cases the questionnaire survey acts as a kind of baseline, the results indicating areas requiring further probing and analysis through informal methods. This type of sequencing will work best in situations where most of the key issues are known or strongly suspected (p.18).

“In studies that have resources to pursue other data collection strategies, questionnaires can be a useful confirmation tools” (Social Research Methods, 2009).

In this case, the survey was intended to serve in part as a diagnostic of the participants’ baseline ideas about power, its mutability, and their relationship to it which would inform the design of the process drama lessons, and in part as data to inform my emerging hypothesis on the role of community and power for urban students of color. (for full text of the survey instrument, see Appendix D, p. 349) The construction of the instrument followed guidelines for survey and questionnaire design, including beginning with “well-defined objectives,” and questions designed with a focus on clarity and neutral phrasing, and on avoiding leading questions, embarrassing questions, hypothetical questions and questions with overt prestige bias (Social Research Methods, 2009). According to Bradburn, Sudman, and Wansink (2004) “no codified rules for question asking exist” (p.4), though, given the “social context” of question asking, “questions must be precisely worded if responses to a survey are to be accurate” (ibid, p.xi). They advocate that one should “ask what you

want to know” (ibid, p.3) and be aware of “the ambiguities of language” (ibid, p.3). They also suggest “pre-testing to weed out ambiguities or miscommunications” (ibid, p.4). Though I was unable to access a group of urban students for pre-testing, I vetted the structure and questions of the survey with a professor of mixed research methodologies and several professional colleagues who have conducted their own research, and the language of the questions for vocabulary, reading level, and word choice with the classroom teacher.

The instrument offered a range of five possible answers per question, including strongly agree, agree, could go either way, disagree, and strongly disagree.

Conventional wisdom says that there should be an odd number of alternatives. This allows a neutral or no opinion response. Other schools of thought contend that an even number of choices is best because it forces the respondent to get off the fence (Social Research Methods, 2009).

I conducted the instrument again as a post-test to see whether there was a significant change in student responses as a result of the project. I also added an open format question: Name anything new you understand about power after this project.

Open format questions are those that ask for unprompted opinions... and the participant is free to answer however he chooses. Open format questions are good for soliciting subjective data ...An obvious advantage is that the variety of responses should be wider and more truly reflect the opinions of the respondents (Social Research Methods, 2009).

3.7.2 Coding Categories

I identified codes relative to the research questions guiding Phase One and suggested by the data. Data collected, coded, and analyzed include my daily field notes and post-class reflections, the daily field notes and reflections/comments of the ethnographer, notes on conversations/discussions with the classroom teacher, and the students’ post-project discussion and open response prompts from the survey. Open codes are identified in bold font and are followed by axial codes which are related to them. The coding categories include:

Baseline ideas about power

Thoughts and feelings about power

Taking power in action

Awareness of immigrant factor and poverty in cultural hegemony

Past

Present

Parallels between past and present

Understanding of collective power**Belief in possible efficacy of collective action****Community in the drama class**

Statements

Actions

Power in the drama class

Statements

Actions

Community and Power

Social interaction

Academic performance

Anti-Community

Statements

Actions

Fairness of the current free market employment system**3.7.3 Lessons Learned, pt. 2**

Ultimately the survey tool was the least helpful component of data generated during Phase One, as I discuss in Chapter 5, the data analysis of this component of the

study. The only exception was the open format prompt at the end of the post-project survey. The final discussion, conducted after the surveys were completed, yielded richer, more detailed, and, I feel, more reliable information on students' reactions to the process drama work and what they felt they had learned. Consequently, I decided to return to interviewing as a vehicle for eliciting post-project data in Phase Two.

I had originally intended to conduct Phase Two of the project in the fall of 2009. However, due to the financial crisis which occurred in October, 2008, the stability of the drama program at Chelsea High School was in question. Rather than risk losing access to the site, I moved the last phase of the project up and conducted it in the spring semester of 2009.

3.8 Phase Two Design

The second and final phase of my research utilized playmaking to facilitate students' understandings of the ways in which their own experiences of discrimination were reflected in broader societal trends and to facilitate the acquisition of skills that would allow them to become agents of social change. The research questions guiding this component of the study were:

- What are the effects of playmaking on facilitating students' understandings of unequal power dynamics, as reflected in cultural hegemony and unequal distribution of resources in their lives?
- What are the effects of using playmaking structures to facilitate students' identity formation as change agents in the issues that affect their lives?
- How can students acquire advocacy skills through participation in a playmaking experience?

- In what ways does the community established in the drama classroom affect students' engagement and facility with the material?

Table 3.3 (see p. 114-17) identifies the research questions, conceptual goals, data collection and analysis strategies, and potential evidence which framed this phase of my research.

The study was conducted with a Drama 2 class of 24 students of mixed ages and races/ethnicities. Of the group, only three of the students had participated in a drama class before and only one had participated in productions, however they demonstrated positive energy, creativity, and thoughtfulness which made them a good choice for the playmaking piece. Three of the students were new immigrants and spoke very limited English, and a third of the students had Individualized Education Plans, indicating a range of learning issues for which specific accommodations must be made. When the project began there were 11 girls and 13 boys in the group. By the time they performed the finished piece, two of the boys were no longer in the school. The development of material occurred in 15 class sessions over a 5-week period from March 3- April 9, 2009. The show rehearsed from April 27- May 18, and performed on May 19, 2009. The final interviews were conducted on May 22, 2009.

The playmaking experience was initially designed to address the research questions guiding the study by uncovering and facilitating students' understandings of the ways in which their own experiences of discrimination are reflected in pervasive systemic inequities at the societal level (Apple, 1995, p.xv) and to facilitate the acquisition of skills that would allow them to become agents of social change (Freire, 1993). A second element involved exploring change agents from the past who fostered social change through collective action.

Table 3.3

Analytic Question Matrix

What do I need to know?	Why do I need to know this?	What kind of data will answer the questions?	Where can I find the data?	How will I analyze the data?	What kinds of evidence will this produce?
What are the effects of playmaking on facilitating students' understandings of unequal power dynamics, as reflected in cultural hegemony and unequal distribution of resources in their lives?					
<p>What do students currently understand about personal and social power?</p> <p>How much do students understand about cultural hegemony and unequal distribution of wealth as factors in power distribution and ownership?</p> <p>In what ways does playmaking allow students to develop their understandings of these dynamics in action?</p>	<p>Student constructions of what constitutes power helps inform my understanding of how much they understand about the parallels between micro (personal) and macro (societal) power situations/structures.</p> <p>Student constructions of the place of money and cultural capital indicates for me their understanding of societal tools for maintaining the control and distribution of power.</p> <p>The first step toward possible change is in understanding the dynamics in play. If playmaking can be used for this purpose, to motivate and facilitate understanding, it is a boon for students and for the field.</p>	<p>Student self-report, performance, scene and story development in the playmaking process, interview data, discussion</p>	<p>Transcripts of semi-structured interviews.</p> <p>Field notes of class observations</p> <p>Ethnographer's field notes of class observations</p> <p>Member check of findings</p>	<p>Inductive analysis: Identification of key themes and patterns as well as contrasts and paradoxes</p>	<p>Information-rich case studies of individual students and of group dynamics, patterns of similarity and difference between participants, some indicators of change over time</p>

What do I need to know?	Why do I need to know this?	What kind of data will answer the questions?	Where can I find the data?	How will I analyze the data?	What kinds of evidence will this produce?
What are the effects of using playmaking structures to facilitate students' identity formation as change agents in the issues that affect their lives?					
<p>Can students imagine themselves in the role of change agents?</p> <p>What stands in the way of their ability to do so?</p> <p>What facilitates their ability to do so?</p>	<p>The unequal power dynamics of today have existed before, and non-dominant peoples have made substantial changes through collective action. If the students can experiment with power through playmaking, they may be able to imagine themselves in the role of change agents.</p>	<p>Students' creation of scenes depicting unequal power dynamics and subsequent change in those dynamics</p> <p>Reflections of the effects on outcomes of changing power dynamics</p> <p>Students' ability to identify strategies employed to change power dynamics</p> <p>Students application of ideas/problems/solutions relative to collective power taking</p>	<p>Transcripts of semi-structured interviews.</p> <p>Field notes of class observation</p> <p>Ethnographer's field notes of class observations</p> <p>Member check of findings</p>	<p>Identification of voice and agency in scene work</p> <p>Identification of voice and agency in interviews</p> <p>Inductive analysis: Identification of key themes and patterns as well as contrasts and paradoxes</p>	<p>a) Identification of student awareness of the role of voice and agency in altering unequal power situations</p> <p>b) Identification of student awareness of collective voice as an aspect of agency</p> <p>c) Interpretation of students' understandings as presented through performance and interview</p>

What do I need to know?	Why do I need to know this?	What kind of data will answer the questions?	Where can I find the data?	How will I analyze the data?	What kinds of evidence will this produce?
How can students acquire advocacy skills through participation in a playmaking experience?					
<p>What do students think advocacy skills are?</p> <p>What skills do they already possess? Which do they lack?</p> <p>What motivates them to advocate for themselves?</p> <p>To what extent can they see the possibilities for collective action as a tool for effective advocacy?</p>	<p>Collective advocacy requires both skills in speaking and presentation and the will to self advocate. Understanding what they know is critical to understanding what they might need/want to know.</p> <p>Collective action is a viable tool for fostering social change, possibly the only one readily available to them. If they're willing to consider the possibility that they <i>could</i> use it, it might be possible to use playmaking to teach them <i>how</i> to use it.</p>	<p>Student self-report, body language, explanation of observed classroom dynamics in interview, styles of advocacy and ability to advocate in playmaking scenes, processing/discussion.</p>	<p>Transcripts of semi-structured interviews.</p> <p>Field notes of class observations.</p> <p>Ethnographer's field notes of class observations</p> <p>Member check of findings</p>	<p>Identification of attitudes/knowledge about advocacy elements in interviews</p> <p>Identification of attitudes/knowledge about advocacy elements in observations</p> <p>Identification of perceptions about power and voice in observations, interviews</p> <p>Inductive analysis: Identification of key themes and patterns as well as contrasts and paradoxes</p>	<p>a) Identifications of advocacy skills and interest in performance and body language.</p> <p>c) Interpretations of students' understandings as presented through performance and in interview.</p>

What do I need to know?	Why do I need to know this?	What kind of data will answer the questions?	Where can I find the data?	How will I analyze the data?	What kinds of evidence will this produce?
In what ways does the community established in the drama classroom affect students' engagement and facility with the material?					
<p>Are students aware of the power that they demonstrate as a community?</p> <p>Can they identify ways that their community-based power could be used to make change in unequal power dynamics?</p>	Literature on Sense of Community and its connection to power is clear. Do they experience it the way that it's described in the literature? If so, their descriptions/discussion can add to an understanding of urban students of color in relationship to community and power.	Student self-report, body language, performances in playmaking, engagement in class time, positive peer interactions, use of optional "sick days", semi-structured interviews, post-performance processing/discussion.	<p>Transcripts of semi-structured interviews.</p> <p>Field notes of class observations.</p> <p>Ethnographer's field notes of class observations</p> <p>Member check of findings</p>	<p>Identification of community and power elements in interviews</p> <p>Identification of community and power elements in observations</p>	<p>a) Identifications of community and power representations in performance and body language.</p> <p>b) Identification of student awareness of community and power as an element of their classroom community.</p> <p>c) Identification of student awareness of community and power as a factor in collective action</p>

SOURCE: Adapted by David Eddy Spicer from *Ethnography and Qualitative Design in Educational Research* (2nd ed.) by M. D. LeCompte and J. Preissle, 1993, San Diego: Academic Press as cited in *Qualitative Research Design* (2nd ed.) by J. Maxwell, 2005, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, p. 100-101.

I planned the playmaking process, and Amy and I co-taught it. Utilizing a variety of strategies, including improvisation, group and individual monologue creation, scene work, movement, games, and music, the students developed an original performance piece that incorporated music, text, image, and video to communicate the roles money and violence play in their lives. The design of the process was formative; I developed exercises and prompts in response to the work they were creating, with the goal of moving their understandings forward and further exploring areas of the topic in which they demonstrated interest and knowledge about unequal power dynamics. I created the script from their words, scenes, and movement pieces, and Amy directed the play for performance.

3.8.1 Interviews

I had attended a workshop on Participant Action Research in which the advantages of video, as opposed to audio-only, recording was discussed, with an emphasis on facial expression and body language as additional forms of data afforded by the medium. As we had used video recording in the development of material for the playmaking piece, and the students seemed reasonably at ease talking with the camera present, I decided to video record the interviews of the participants in the playmaking project. The camera was operated by a student, and I conducted interviews with the 15 participants who were available and willing, in a standardized, open-ended format. (for full text of the interview guide, see Appendix E, p. 351) The interview questions asked the participants to reflect on their personal experiences of the project (What will stick in your mind from this experience? Why?), as well as exploring the learning objectives (Name one thing you think you've learned from this experience. About the world? About

power?) and their perspectives on collective action (Why do you think people protest/picket/do collective action?).

3.8.2 Data Collection and Triangulation

I took notes while students were preparing scenes, movement pieces, etc., and I dedicated time after each class period to record my memory of events. This was particularly important for those classes in which I was teaching the bulk of the time. Amy also provided feedback and reflection in regular meetings. Additional triangulation was provided by Bevin, who was able to be present for 25 of the 30 sessions and provided detailed ethnography. A review and vetting of preliminary findings was conducted with 19 of the 24 student participants, through a one-page itemization of my initial findings which they had the opportunity to read and comment on individually, in writing.

3.8.3 Coding Categories

The direction of the students' original work moved away from the research questions which informed the design of the project, and the coding categories for the data reflect the "new direction" dictated by the students' interests. I identified codes relative to the research questions guiding Phase Two and added codes suggested by the data. Data collected, coded, and analyzed include my daily field notes and post-class reflections, the daily field notes and reflections/comments of the ethnographer, notes on conversations/discussions with the classroom teacher, and the students' post-project interviews and group discussion. Open codes are identified in bold font and are followed by axial codes which are related to them. The coding categories include:

Characterization of "the problem"

Money

Violence

Interaction of money and violence

Awareness of unequal power dynamics

On a personal level

On a societal level

Role of poverty

Role of race/ethnicity

Changed orientation to unequal power dynamics

Agency

Voice

Understanding of collective power

Belief in possible efficacy of collective action

Effects of Applied Theatre/Drama

Applied Theatre/Drama and power

Applied Theatre/Drama and community

Community in the drama class

Statements

Actions

Power in the drama class

Statements

Actions

Community and Power

Social interaction

Academic performance

Anti-Community

Statements

Actions

3.9 Concerns, Ethical and Otherwise

Complex ethical concerns result from my participant status in designing the drama lessons and playmaking plans, and in facilitating their implementation. As Nicholson (2005) points out, the values of participant researchers will be reflected in the content of the curriculum and on its subsequent outcomes. In a process of analysis in which “analysis is the interplay between researcher and data” (Strauss and Corbin, 1998, p.13), the challenge of objectivity, of identifying patterns from human complexity, and interpreting sometimes minute events that can make a critical difference in outcomes can be daunting. The presence of an outside ethnographer and the classroom teacher as co-interpreters of events mitigate some of these dynamics. Further mitigation is provided by the careful use of coding categories and seeking alternative themes and rival explanations, both inductively and logically. However, this is *my* work, reflective of my interests, designed by me and, in some cases, implemented by me. My interest in facilitating change in an unjust world cannot help but be present in these findings. Ultimately, I’m left with a question: How do we put ourselves aside enough to find ‘truth’ in an experience that is so interpersonal in nature, so rich in emotional events, and so important, even if only for a brief time, in the lives of ourselves and our students?

Chapter 4

Data Analysis of the Preliminary Study

4.1 Introduction

The preliminary study, a component of my coursework in research methodologies, was designed to provide foundational data on urban students' understandings of power through a combination of Boal-based drama work and student interviews. The research questions guiding this study were:

- How do urban students of color understand the effect of power dynamics on their lives? What meanings do these words hold for them?
- Are they articulating the same level of knowledge verbally as they do in performance?
- How do students view the connection between community and power?

The preliminary study covered a single 80-minute class period, with follow-up interviews with eleven class members. The findings of this study are constrained by the brevity of the project and by the lack of investigator triangulation, design problems which I rectified in the subsequent phases of the study. However, in spite of the very limited scope of this component, the data gathered and analyzed during the preliminary study significantly informed the wider project, which examined the use of applied theatre/drama for facilitating students' understandings of power on a societal level and development of strategies for wielding power effectively in self-advocacy efforts, by providing substantial data on the (unanticipated) element of community as a potential factor in students' experience of power. I will discuss the preliminary study data in relation to 1) student constructions of power as demonstrated in their scenes and interpersonal

dynamics, and as discussed in interview; 2) classroom community; 3) demonstrations of community and power as discussed in the literature review.

This chapter includes a more detailed overview of the project design outlined in Chapter 3, analysis of the data relative to the research questions, a discussion of the possible connections between community and power for these students, and my conclusions.

4.2 Project Design

The preliminary study was conducted with students in a Drama 2 class at Chelsea High School. This group was selected because they were very tight-knit and demonstrated a high degree of trust in each other and their teacher, which resulted in risk-taking in scene work. A core group of students in the class had been together in another drama class the previous year, and the class had 24 registered students of mixed ages and races. On the day of the class observation, the group was comprised of 19 sophomores, juniors, and seniors, (ages 15-20) though there were only two sophomores in the group. The students are lower income, mostly Latino/Latina, with several African American and bi-racial students, and two white students. There were 8 girls and 11 boys. Over half of the students were on Individual Education Plans, indicating a range of learning issues for which specific accommodations must be made, and many of them were seen as a problem in their other classes, according to Amy.

The initial plan was to observe a drama class that focused on issues of power and to conduct follow-up interviews with one or two students in order to further explore their ideas as depicted in the performance/theatre work. I co-planned the lesson with Amy, the classroom teacher. It was structured loosely

around the work of Augusto Boal, incorporating several different types of performance opportunities within the same lesson- exercises, tableaux, and scene work. (for full text of the lesson, see Appendix F, p.352) The warm-up exercise, “Blind Car” (Boal, 2002) in which students steer their blind partners around the stage by touch, was fast-paced and allowed me to observe students interacting spontaneously with each other and with ideas of control. The tableaux and early scene work were based on images of power from the students’ lives, and included elements of church, home, work, and the world. These allowed data collection on the students’ planning dynamics, their initial discussions about power, their choices of situation and roles depicting power, and their physical depictions of power dynamics. The final scene work was based on personal stories of power situations from their lives, and included socio-economic discrimination, custody issues, and friendship issues. These stories, which were quite personal and reflected the degree of trust experienced by these students towards Amy and each other, suggested rich areas of inquiry for the interview. Amy taught the lesson, and I observed and took notes, sitting on the stage very close to the students.

4.3 Observation

The observation took place on November 15, 2007. In an effort to develop a baseline understanding of how these urban students understood the idea of power and its effects on their lives (research questions 1 and 2), the class session was designed to explore students’ definitions of power, ask them to reflect on where they saw power demonstrated in their daily lives, and demonstrate the ways that power dynamics affect them in school, at home, at work, and in the world. The data resulting from the observation of the lesson was multi-layered and complex,

as the students demonstrated their understandings of power dynamics in games and scene work.

The first “layer” was the students’ explicit understandings and interpretations of power and power dynamics as presented in the work they did. Their explicit scene and character choices, blocking, and the topics they chose to show communicated some of their held beliefs about what power is, who has it, and what it looks like. In explicit choices, students identified the power of ministers, God, cops, teachers, principals, criminals, parents, grandparents, friends, and people with money.

The following excerpt offers insight into the open sharing typical of the students in this class, and their thoughtful reflections on questions of power raised by Amy. The group had created a tableau in which a minister stood in a pulpit, arms extended toward the heavens, with his head back and eyes closed. The members of the congregation reflected his pose, except for one congregant who was stretched out on the floor, in the rapture. Students understood the intent of the scene:

4.1 “They’re feeling God right now.”

“Especially Jimmy. He’s overtaken with the rapture.”

Amy: ‘Who has the power in this scene?’

Several students: “Carlos.” (the minister)

Olvin: “God.”

Several students: ‘That’s right.’ ‘God.’ ‘God does.’

There was a second layer of implicit beliefs embedded in scene choices and discussed/uncovered by the students acting as audience for their classmates' scenes. These include guns as power, money as power that may trump even guns and cops, sex as more powerful than money when dealing with the police, and a range of values concerning the status and usefulness of adults as depicted in several scenes (the minister as a representative of God, the dismissive and demeaning principals in several school scenes and the usefulness/uselessness of the unemployed father in a family scene). In a tableau depicting an armed robbery, students debated the relative power of guns and money. In the tableau, Edia held a gun to the head of Christine, who knelt in front of her, facing the audience, and pointed another at Olvin, who was holding money out towards her.

4.2 Amy: "Who has the power in this scene?"

Jazzmin: "Edia. She does. She has the gun."

Margarito: "Olvin has power 'cause he has the money."

The students' need for power, and their ambivalence regarding adult power, was present in their tableaux and scene work as well, as is clear in the following excerpt.

4.3 In the image, two cars, Angelica's and one with Ricky driving and Cristian in the back seat, are at right angles at an intersection. Yesenia (a cop) is holding her hands in a 'stop' gesture at both cars. Anthony is crossing the street.

Amy: "Who has the power in this scene?"

A chorus of voices: “The cop.”

Ricky (*a driver*): “I have power. I could run them both over.”

There were also embedded implicit beliefs that were present but not discussed. For example, John, the only white male in the class, played the cop in a repeating scene in which every other participant was of color. No one mentioned it as the class processed the scene. In a recurring fast food scene, in which John was the only white person in the group, the white and Latina customers were treated very differently, as the following excerpt from my notes demonstrates.

4.4 John is now the customer, Lyanna is behind the counter, and Katelyn is in line after John. Michael is in the kitchen. John talks like a bossy, white-guy jerk, making a lot of changes to his order. Lyanna is completely polite to him. Michael translates the order into Spanish for Lyanna. Katelyn, customer #2, gets in Lyanna’s face, complaining, “I thought this was a fast food restaurant.”

Lyanna answers: “I don’t appreciate you talking that to me!”

She takes the power role and tells her to back off, but is still polite to John.

But Michael spits in his food. They talk about John in Spanish.

The students in role as workers depicted an interesting passive-aggressive response to John, who was very aggressive and unpleasant, but direct aggression to Katelyn. Why? Is it because she’s female? Latina? Familiar? (Katelyn and Lyanna are half-sisters.) Students also didn’t comment on the principal who

dismissively asked students who'd been brought to her office for a minor offense, "What did you do this time?"

4.3.1 Community

An interesting and unexpected aspect of the observation was the power demonstrated by the students in the class through their support of one another and the marked unity among the class members. The class is composed of students from a range of "cliques", including "football players, geeks, nerds, brains, Goths and gansta's," as one student put it. According to the students, they are not necessarily friends outside of the class, though they speak to each other in the halls. However, their group identity in the Drama 2 class was positive and powerful. During the hour and twenty minute class, the students were kind, even loving to each other, physically close in non-sexual ways, and made many shared jokes, but with no racial jokes of any kind and a complete absence of "capping," (making denigrating jokes towards one another for status).

Their community was demonstrated throughout the class in small and large moments. For example, when Amy called the students to the stage to start the class, they instantly stood together in a tight circle, males and females intermixed, arms around one another. This is not typical of the physicality of students in other classes, according to the students. When Josh sneezed during scene development, a chorus of voices from throughout the auditorium called out, "Bless you!" Their community was also evident in their conduct towards one another during Blind Car. In the game, students in pairs are a car and driver. The "car," with eyes closed, is steered around the space by touch by the driver. In the first round, students were wildly careening their "vehicle" around the stage; it was heart-stopping. Then they switched roles. When they switched back, the reckless

driving of the first round changed completely; the driving was more gentle, slow and cautious, without the traffic congestion and “near-misses” of the earlier melee. In reflecting on the experience, students identified the importance of their trust in their driver as key to allowing them to enjoy the game:

4.5 Josh: “The car was fun and scary at the same time...The first person who was driving, I trusted him.”

A noticeable degree of trust and community was consistently demonstrated by the students from the beginning of the class, when they cheered three of their classmates who had received awards for their standardized test scores,

4.6 Amy: “Everyone look at how nice Michael looks.”

All: “Oooooooooooooo”

Amy then asked the students to tell me what the John and Abigail Adams Scholarship is (a full tuition scholarship awarded to students who have a high pass on the state standardized test). All cheered for the 3 students in class who got it- Yesenia, Katelyn, and Michael.

to the end, when they shared deeply personal stories of having been disempowered in their own lives. The following excerpt describes a scene created from Angelica’s story of a custody battle in her family, as her sister decided whether to live with their mother or father.

4.7 Argument between mother and father.

Edia says she's going with Dad. The family questions her choice.

Lyanna: (*a sister*) "He doesn't do anything for you."

Latisha: (*a sister*) "He doesn't even work. Why do you want to go with him?"

Margarito: (*father, as they leave*) "I'll buy you something nice."

This scene was a reflection of a deeply personal and upsetting moment from Angelica's life, shared with her small group in planning and the entire class in performance. It seems possible that this demonstrates her trust in the group. Amy also commented on their pronounced and unusual degree of community.

During the planning of scene work, the students consistently demonstrated collaboration, seamlessly sharing leadership in the planning process, and taking joint responsibility for making sure everyone was included. Further, they demonstrated competence in the drama work through their use of space in tableaux, their choices of scene material, and their performance skills. This was surprising as only three of the students in the class are "drama kids" and participate in plays after school. Most of the students have had no more than one drama class previous to this one, and for about a third of the group, this was their first experience ever. Given that half of the class members were academically challenged, and that many were seen as problems, behavioral or learning, in other classes, I was interested in understanding why they were successful in this class, and particularly how their sense of community contributed to the power they demonstrated as students in drama.

4.4 Preliminary Study Interviews

My original intent was to conduct an interview with one or two class members, but given the range of perspectives in the class, I ultimately selected four students, two girls and two boys. I made these selections based on their power-taking within scenes, their relative powerfulness as members of the classroom community, and insights offered by Amy. I chose students who represented various points on the spectrum of powerless to powerful and the racial mix in the class. My initial interview, on November 19, 2007, was with a senior girl named Edia who spoke little in class but had taken overt power roles during the class session (choosing to portray an armed robber, for example). Subsequently many of the participants asked to be interviewed, and Edia's interview had generated such a wealth of helpful data that I ultimately interviewed eleven students, 6 boys (Ricky, Michael, Carlos, Anthony, Jimmy, and John) and 5 girls (Edia, Angelica, Yesenia, Katelyn, and Jazzmin). (At their request, I am using their first names rather than pseudonyms in this paper.)

I interviewed Ricky, Angelica, and Michael in individual interviews and the others in two single-gender small groups on January 7, 8, and 9, 2008. The students represented a cross-section of the class, racially, academically, and socially. The interview questions reflected both my interest in their constructions, understanding and experience of power (How would you define power? Where in your world do you see it and what does it look like? Where do you feel powerful? If you could have more power in one area of your life, what would you choose?) and addressed the question of whether, and to what extent, they were able to articulate the same level of knowledge verbally as they did in performance. The later interviews also had questions reflecting my emerging interest in the power

I'd observed in their community during the class session (Do you feel powerful/powerless in this class? When and why?). (for full text of interview guide, see Appendix C, p. 347). I audio recorded their interviews and transcribed them, or had them transcribed, in their entirety.

4.4.1 Coding Categories

Coding categories were developed initially by exploring concepts and ideas that occurred both in the class work and in interview. (The results of the interviews mapped closely onto the observation data, with multiple levels of understanding and awareness reflected in their responses.) A second level of categories was developed by exploring areas of power that were embedded in what was performed and discussed, even though they hadn't necessarily been explicitly identified. (For example, there were several scenes in which money was an identified power element, and students talked about money as power in relationship to jobs, family, and friends, though I never asked a question about money and power.) A third level of codes represent areas which were observable, though not discussed or identified in either context. The power of community, which informed the students' behavior in the observation and was an embedded concept in students' reflections on family and school life, is an example.

In this analysis, I will focus on the following:

- Student constructions of power
- Manifestations/demonstrations of power
- Uses of power by students
- Student constructions of community
- Communal uses of power

Data collected, coded, and analyzed include my field notes from the observation of the class session and post-class reflection, notes on my conversation/discussion with the classroom teacher, and the students' post-project interviews. The analysis that follows is considered in relation to literature on constructions of power, Sense of Community (SOC), and Communal Power Orientation (CPO) detailed in Chapter 2.

4.5 Constructions of Power

Power is everywhere, and affects every aspect of our lives, but its definition is elusive (Keltner, Anderson, and Gruenfeld, 2003). Early in the interview, students were asked three questions designed to elicit an understanding of their definitions and perceptions of power:

- 1) For you, what is power? How would *you* define power dynamics?
- 2) How can you tell when someone has power? What does that look like? Example?
- 3) How can you tell when someone doesn't have power? What does that look like? Example?

In interview, as in their scene work, students identified money, strength, ability, and control over others as forms of power.

4.8 Michael: "Money gives a lot of power to people.... It shouldn't be like that."

4.9 Ricky: "Strong. Someone strong or something strong."

4.10 Jazzmin: “I see it more as control. Whereas you have the control over a situation, or over somebody else, or even yourself. Like how you think something should be done....”

4.11 Carlos: “The ability to perform something or do something... the measure of your ability to do something...”

4.12 Jimmy: “Power has lots of influence and...authority.”

These constructions of power align with the description in Burnham’s *Managerial Revolution*, which states that “modern power was first and foremost about the entitlement to manage people, to command, to set the rules of conduct, and extort obedience to the rules” (Bauman, 2001, p.40).

The descriptions of what makes one powerless again included money and strength,

4.13 Michael: “Money makes them powerless.”

4.14 Ricky: “A small little person who couldn’t hurt anyone else.”

with the addition of the importance of voice, of being heard and noticed by others, as a factor in power and powerlessness. In discussing what it looks like when someone has no power, students responded:

4.15 Katelyn: “I think they’re not noticed. They’re just *there*.”

- 4.16 John: “They’re usually in the back. No one’s paying attention to them... They’re not saying much, no one can hear them.”

The importance of voice was a consistent thread in every interview. The students identified speaking your mind as a manifestation of power and a way of both taking and demonstrating power.

- 4.17 Yesenia: “If you don’t speak up, then you’re never really gonna’ have power. I think in order for you to have power you have to speak up for yourself and follow what you believe in.”

- 4.18 Michael: “Every time, you know, every time anywhere that you, you stay quiet and you don’t speak your mind, to me, that’s like, you just lost all the power you had.”

The use of first names in this paper is a case in point. In discussing the results of the observation and interviews, I’d planned to create pseudonyms, but when I told the class, the students protested. ‘No, Miss! I’m proud of what I said! I want people to know it was me!’

A second component present in every interview was community and the importance of connectedness. Students discussed at length their families, jobs, school, and friends, and were able to identify aspects of power that inform all of their relationships. Students report feeling powerful in the contexts in which they

are most closely connected to others, particularly in their families. In discussing how it feels to have power in her family, Edia said,

- 4.19 “It feels like you’re in your clouds. You’re, you’re queen, you’re... Nobody can stop you...Like on the highway. You’re going full speed. Imagine yourself on a mustang. Nobody there. No cops.... Feeling the breeze. That’s how I feel like.”

Conversely, in response to the question, ‘What does it feel like when you don’t have any power?’ Edia answered,

- 4.20 “It feels you’re dropping in a black hole that...you don’t see when to stop.”

4.5.1 Social Power

Keltner, Anderson, and Gruenfeld (2003) distinguish between psychological and social power, and identify the resources of social power as affection, information, attention, or humor, and punishments as storytelling, teasing, gossiping, and gift giving. These ‘resources of social power’ reflect dynamics I observed in the Drama 2 class. The students treated each other and Amy with obvious affection. For example, two boys, who had been in conflict in a scene, stood with arms draped over each other’s shoulders while listening to the next set of directions (unusual in this school environment in which homophobic remarks are regularly heard in the halls and cafeteria). When sawdust was spilled on the stage, students noticed that Amy was sweeping it up and rushed to help.

The following excerpt from my notes points to the positive community in the group and the way in which social power was negotiated without conflict.

- 4.21 During the planning of this scene, John's group decided to re-create the bust [arrest] from the tableau work. There was a debate between the boys and girls regarding what the girls' concerns would be in that moment.
- Lyanna: "What would we say?" Girls insist on *their* right to decide. Boys step back and let them.

The students consistently listened to one another, shared jokes, and trusted each other with intimate personal stories. According to Amy and the students themselves, this represents a substantial shift in their normal school behaviors.

Ultimately, Keltner et al. (2003) are most interested in the question: How does power change the behavior of the actor? They focus on the ways in which power can be used in positive ways for pro-social purposes. In understanding the possible pro-social purposes of power, I found it helpful to consider the connection between power and action, the importance of Sense of Community for psychological health, and Communal Power Orientation, as defined by Chen, Lee-Chai, and Bargh (2001), and the ways in which these factors may help explain the outcomes of the preliminary study.

4.6 Power and Action

People need to feel powerful in order to act. Power and control, as defined by meaningful decision-making power, voice, and choice, is a physical and psychological wellness factor for children (Prilleltensky, Nelson and Peirson,

2001). According to Prilleltensky et al. (2001), the goal is to create communities in which individuals have enough power to satisfy their needs and work in concert with others to advance collective goals. Further, there is evidence that high power states stimulate goal-directed behavior, and that the possession of power leads directly to action (Galinsky, Gruenfeld, and Magee, 2003). The Drama 2 class fits the description of such a community, according to the students themselves, as is demonstrated in the following excerpt.

4.22 Michael: “I took this class because, this class, in many ways, lets you express yourself, you know? Say what is in your mind. And I think that’s important for kids, like, especially kids my age...and share with people how they feel.”

The participation and engagement of the students, who focused and worked consistently across the hour-and-twenty-minute period immediately preceding lunch, may be characterized as goal-directed behavior. The students’ sense of power in the Drama 2 community seems to allow them to act, even though they are not always likely to take an active role in other school situations.

A possible answer to the question of *why* community is a source of power for these students lies in an understanding of the psychological concept of Sense of Community, and a consideration of Communal Power Orientation.

4.7 Sense of Community

Sense of Community (SOC), as discussed in Chapter 2, provides a useful frame for considering the importance of community for the mental and social

health of the individual, and the ways in which groups can access and utilize power through their community orientation. The Drama 2 class at Chelsea High School demonstrated a consistent and substantial degree of community (SOC) throughout my observation. They worked together without conflict, supported each other verbally and non-verbally, and had a number of shared rituals which they joyfully enacted throughout the class, reflecting Sennett's (2003) construction of rituals as a form of social bonding (p.213). One notable example featured Anthony, a very "cool" 18-year-old student who was the quarterback on the football team. The bell rang at the end of the class, and the other students called out, 'Lunch time! Anthony, do it! Do it! Ding-dong! Do it!' With a quick glance in my direction, and a moment of hesitation, he perfectly mimicked the sound of the bell. "Ding-dong! Lunchtime!" The entire class cheered, and then they left for lunch. This is a daily ritual, according to Amy, and is unusual behavior for any "cool" senior boy, and for Anthony in particular. This behavior can be considered in light of Galinsky, Gruenfeld, and Magee's (2003) studies indicating that disinhibition is a sign of power.

Further, Amy, the drama teacher, was considered a part of the community by all of the students interviewed, and was identified by the students as "tough," having high expectations, and listening to their opinions. The following excerpts are from students answering the question, "What about this class makes you feel powerful or powerless? Why?"

4.23 John: "She [Amy] does, like, actually pay attention to our opinions. And not just mine or his. To everyone's."

4.24 Jazzmin: “She’s so keen on listening to our own opinions...”

4.25 Yesenia: “It’s different from other classes where that doesn’t happen.”

This reflects studies pointing to the importance in the successful development of voice and influence in community of one or more supportive adults in the environment who acknowledge the competence of the adolescents and support their power in the community context (Evans, 2007; Whitlock, 2007).

A second notable moment, excerpted from my notes, demonstrates the students’ connectedness with Amy, or Miss C. as they call her.

4.26 During a scene in which there was a teacher role, Jazzmin said, “If I had a blonde wig, I could be Miss C.” Then the group of 3 students smiled at Amy with no trace of irony. (Amy is tall, thin, and patrician. Jazzmin is short, heavy, and African American.)

McMillan and Chavis (1986) identified four components of SOC: belonging, connectedness, influence, and fulfillment of needs, and the importance of both having power and recognizing it. In interview, the students identified the Drama 2 class as a place where they felt powerful, where their ideas were listened to, where they could take the risk to speak their minds, and where they experienced a sense of belonging.

- 4.27 Ricky: “We all just, like, even though we’re not all really close friends, we all just get along. You know, like, no one’s over here like stereotyping anyone or anything like that.”

The students, from those who appeared to be very self-confident to very cautious, reflected on the importance of the group and on their ability to be themselves in the environment, as opposed to in the general school environment.

- 4.28 Ricky: “You can have fun and express yourself and be who you want to be.”

- 4.29 Michael: “People make you feel comfortable, people make you feel like you can say anything to them, you know...”

- 4.30 Angelica: “I just want to open up to people and show them who I am, in reality.”

Students also spoke about their sense of agency in the class, and their ability to make choices, demonstrate their skills, and help their peers. In the following excerpt, Jimmy, a gifted student, discusses the power he felt participating in a group game.

- 4.31 Jimmy: “I really feel powerful in a lot of team situations, in which there’s a lot of insight or strategies involved. ‘Cause I’m able to help a lot and

figure out a lot and take charge and lead the team in a positive way...use my power in a positive way to get the team in a good position.”

John, an athlete who hopes to become a professional baseball player but struggles academically, explicitly makes the connection between knowledge and power in the following excerpt.

4.32 John: “I’d like to have power like Jimmy has, like he said how people go to him...cause like, you know, he’s smart...he’s good at like strategies and stuff...”

The dynamics in the Drama 2 class seem to fulfill the needs of a broad range of students by offering them an environment in which they experience a sense of “belonging” and “connectedness” and a recognition of their own power as described in the literature on SOC (McMillan and Chavis, 1986). In interview, the students identified the importance of these needs and the ways they are met in the class, as is demonstrated in the following excerpt.

4.33 Edia: “Some people say, you know, ‘You look little grumpy’ whatever... But once I get to this class, it changes. Because this where you can, you know, be yourself, be your own self. And that’s what I like about it... that’s why, you know, I put it as my number one [choice]...”

Sense of Community seems to be a source of power for the students in Drama 2, and power stimulates action. Communal Power Orientation provides a frame

for understanding the nature of that action and the students' demonstrated concern for each other and for Amy.

4.8 Communal Power Orientation

According to Chen, Lee-Chai and Bargh (2001), individuals with a communal orientation to power rather than an exchange orientation, when in a high power state, will use their power for the good of the group (communal) rather than advantaging themselves individually (exchange). Their much-cited quantitative studies demonstrate that power is connected to social goals for individuals, and that high power states stimulate collective goal behavior in communally oriented individuals.

The students in Drama 2 consistently demonstrated a communal orientation to the exercise of power, both in interview, during the observation, and in their interpersonal relationships in class. In interview, in response to the question, 'When in your life do you feel the most powerful?' the students identified helping roles as those that made them feel most powerful. The situations discussed include caretaking younger siblings, responsibility for the safety of young children at work, participation in the family as wage earners, leadership on sports teams, leadership of classroom activities, and interventions in racial incidents in public. The examples offered by the students share several features, including 1) a sense of being an important part of the function of a system, 2) having a higher degree of knowledge or competence than others in the situation, and 3) a moral imperative to contribute to the situation as a result of that competence.

- 4.34 Michael: “I feel pretty powerful...It’s because I’m like, able to talk to people and things like that. You know, help them out when they have a problem and things like that...”

In interview, Edia shared an instance in which the community came together to exercise power in the interests of justice.

- 4.35 Edia: “And Hector Morales, I guess he had his ipod or MP3 out and one of the teachers said, ‘Put it away.’ And he was folding it up and putting it away in his pocket. And I guess the teacher was walk, like, walked with him toward our history class. And they really got into a fight. And Dante interfered and was like, ‘Hector, stop bein’ a bitch!’ you know, over it, and the teacher said, ‘Did you just call me a bitch?!’ He was like, ‘No, I didn’t Miss!’...And then the whole class defended him...”

The CPO of the students was also reflected in scene work, in which the students’ constructions of community were interwoven with their ideas of power in scenes depicting situations at home, school, church, and in the neighborhood. One example was a recurring fast food restaurant scene, in which the ‘workers’ take power from the obnoxious patron as he attacks their language, intelligence, immigration status, and income. The following excerpt from my notes details the interaction.

- 4.36 Carlos: “Hello! Do I have to speak in Spanish? Do you understand minimum wage? Minimum wage-o?”

They respond by supporting each other, translating his order into Spanish, helping the girl working the register, and maintaining an outward semblance of respect while delaying his order and spitting in his food.

Many of the students shared stories, during the final scene work in the class session and in interview, that reflect the dynamics of this scene, in which they, as stronger or more confident individual(s) step in on behalf of someone who cannot defend themselves. Michael's story involved two men on the bus, frustrated that the Spanish speakers on the bus didn't understand that they wanted to move to the back, saying, "Move, you stupid spicks!" Michael confronted them and asked what made them feel they were so much better than the people around them just because they spoke English. He proudly shared his closing line, "If you're so much better than us, why are you on the same bus as we are?"

Finally, the students demonstrated a communal power orientation interpersonally, regularly making choices that were in the best interests of the group rather than any one individual. This was demonstrated in their negotiation of ideas for tableaux and scenes, and consistent shared leadership and lack of conflict in making decisions in small groups. The importance of the communal good was demonstrated in the following situation which occurred toward the end of the class. During a scene in which a bribe was offered, a dollar changed hands and was misplaced. This could have disrupted the class and generated conflict. Instead, one of the students stepped in and mediated the situation, apparently with the goal of maintaining community:

4.37 Yesenia: "Angelica. What did you do with my dollar?"

Angelica: “I gave it back to you.”

Yesenia: “Where is it?”

Lyanna: “Okay, we’ll deal with the dollar at lunch. Get one from

Michael. He has two.”

All laugh.

4.9 Negative Cases

In coding the data for anti-community, the students most represented are Edia and Ricky. Edia is very self-contained, described by Ricky as “that little, quiet one.” She spoke very little in class, though she stood with the other students and participated fully in all activities, and, as she shared in interview, considered herself part of the classroom community. Edia experienced conflict with Amy, though not overtly, as the following excerpt demonstrates.

4.38 Edia: “I gotta’ apologize to Miss. C. Um, Miss C. is a really person, I don’t know. I think, I personally think that she’s been a little bit more nice, a little bit more into us ‘cause you’re here... Usually when she’s not, I mean, I’m sorry but she’s being a (does double quotation marks in the air, her mouth forming a letter “B”).”

Bethany: “Are you referring to a bitch?”

Edia: (laugh) “Yeah.”

Amy had no idea that Edia had a problem with her, as she didn’t demonstrate it in class. In an entertaining coda, at the end of semester, she gave Amy a card thanking her for being her “third favorite teacher of all time.”

Ricky was more overt in his resistance and need for power. In interview he was clear about the community he experienced in the class, as demonstrated in excerpts 4.27 and 4.28. However, he often had difficulty relinquishing power in scene work, either trying to determine what would be performed or refusing to enact the plan during performance. For example, during development of the scene of the cars on the bridge (excerpt 4.3), Ricky led the group in laying out the blocking. This was a rare instance of direct, single leadership in a group, and the group included two strong class leaders, Anthony (a social leader) and Yesenia (an academic leader). Ricky's subsequent statement in the discussion of who had the power in the scene, "I have power. I could run them both over," is a repeating theme with him. In the following excerpt, Ricky demonstrates this theme in action.

- 4.39 Cristian and Ricky are both with Yesenia. They have a pushing match and Anthony, as a security guard, starts dragging them to Angelica, the principal. Ricky really resists, not violently, but very persistently. Anthony struggles to hold onto Cristian, who's going with him, and hang onto Ricky, who isn't. He finally gets them to the principal's office and they are both suspended for fighting.
- Anthony: (complaining) "Ricky, he wasn't supposed to do anything."
- Another student: "This is just like yesterday."

Ricky's need for power, and his focus on the importance of being physically strong (excerpt 4.9), became clearer during his interview, in which he shared the story of his older brother's near fatal stabbing in a gang incident at age

13. Ricky was 11 years old at the time, “too little to do anything, too weak.” He became a body-builder and football player as a result. A moment at the end of his interview points to his possible desire to extend his relationship with Amy. Halfway out of the room, he turned back and said, “You can tell Miss C. about my brother if you want. That would be okay.”

Both Edia and Ricky demonstrated more overt power needs than the other students in the class, but in interview reflected a similar degree of connection and community reported by the other students.

4.10 Limitations of the Analysis

The Preliminary Study stands apart from the subsequent components of the project in its narrow scope. The single class session, with ethnography provided by me and, through post-class discussion, Amy, yielded a very manageable quantity of data. The interviews clarified and expanded on my initial theories regarding the events observed in the class. However, as I discussed in Chapter 3, I had one set of eyes and ears on what occurred, and I observed one group of students, whom I had never met before, for one class period. I have coded and analysed carefully, but do not suggest that these results are anything but local in their implications. However, I integrated consideration of the role of community as a factor in student performance in the subsequent components of the project, in order to further explore the questions considered in this chapter.

4.11 Conclusion

Young people suggest that they feel a stronger self-described sense of community in contexts where they experience voice and resonance, some power and influence, and adequate adult support and challenge (Evans, 2007, p.693).

The data which emerged from this preliminary study can be considered relative to three bodies of literature: the psychological, social, and behavioral effects of power on individuals (Keltner, Anderson, and Gruenfeld, 2003; Galinsky, Gruenfeld, and Magee, 2003; Prilleltensky, Nelson and Peirson, 2001), Sense of Community (McMillan and Chavis, 1986; Sarason, 1986; Adelson and O'Neil, 1966), and Communal Power Orientation (Chen, Lee Chai, and Bargh, 2001). In the Drama 2 class, the students seemed to feel powerful (as demonstrated in classroom performance and discussed in interview), they exhibited goal-oriented behavior, and they demonstrated a communal power orientation. However, as many questions as answers emerged from this preliminary study. What was it about the drama experience, both the lesson observed in this preliminary study and the dynamics of the class as a whole, which generated the sense of community experienced by these students? Did the students' mutual recognition that they were "doing the job well" (Sennett, 2003, p.56) in drama allow them to respect self and other in that environment in a way that isn't available to them in most of school? Is this dynamic specific to this group of urban students? Is it something in the structure of drama?

Research indicates that many forms of drama facilitate the development of SOC, which seemed to be a source of power for the students in Drama 2 (Nelson, 2011; Nelson, 2005; Nelson, Colby & McIlrath, 2001; Wagner, 1998; Manley & O'Neill, 1997). Cahill (2002) identifies the critical elements of a supportive community as “caring relationships, high expectation messages and opportunities for meaningful participation and contribution” (p.16). Each of the students in the study identified the quality of the relationship environment of the class group as central to their participation and learning in both personal and artistic arenas. Factors identified by the students as critical components of their SOC as a class include voice and the freedom to be their ‘true selves’ and ‘speak their minds’ as factors in their sense of power in the class. This reflects the findings of other researchers regarding the power of voice, both in drama and for students of color in general (Prentki and Preston, 2009; Nicholson, 2005; Fine and Weis, 2003; Manley & O'Neill, 1997; Taylor, 1991; Goodlad, 1988).

Acceptance and belonging with their peers and their teacher are also identified as central factors in the community orientation of the class. In previous research on the effects of drama on classroom community, there is evidence that drama structures facilitate a sense of collaboration between teachers and students, and within the peer group (Gallagher, 2007; Nelson, Colby and McIlrath, 2001; Wagner, 1998; Jackson in Manley & O'Neill, 1997; Neelands, 1990).

Power is necessary for the psychological health of individuals (Prilleltensky, Nelson and Peirson, 2001), stimulates all action (Galinsky, Gruenfeld, and Magee, 2003), and can be utilized for pro-social purposes by those with a communal power orientation (Chen, Lee-Chai and Bargh, 2001). O'Toole (1992) proposes that all art, including drama “operates between two polarities, the

urge to explore and the urge to control” (p.23). He identifies control, power, purpose and meaning as significant elements fundamental to the dramatic process. Dramatic art is defined as “primarily concerned with identity and community – the need to be and the need to belong” and therefore also concerned with power and control (ibid, p.24). O’Toole discusses power and control in terms of asserting identity, controlling the communal situation and enabling people to experience belonging (ibid, p.25).

Power is a tool for personal growth and social transformation. I’m left with an overarching question: Is this a dynamic that can be fostered in other drama classes, or in other subject areas, to improve the academic performance of urban students of color?

Chapter 5

Data Analysis of Phase One: Process Drama

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents analysis of the data collected during Phase One of my research project, which utilized process drama as an approach to teaching U.S. labor history and collective action, introducing the Ludlow Massacre, a coal strike in Ludlow, Colorado in 1914, as an exemplar of the dynamics typical of worker-owner conflicts in the past and moving into present day labor situations. The key questions guiding this phase of the research were:

- What are the effects of process drama on facilitating students' understandings of unequal power dynamics, as reflected in cultural hegemony and unequal distribution of resources in their lives?
- What are the effects of integrating social and labor history with contemporary themes in creating a context for understanding current unequal power dynamics?
- In what ways can teaching labor history from the past affect students' constructions of collective action in the present?
- In what ways does the community established in the drama classroom affect students' engagement and facility with the material?

Consideration of the role of community builds on data collected and analyzed in the preliminary project (see Ch. 4) which seems to indicate that community has a positive effect on students' academic function in the drama classroom. The process drama lessons introduced issues of cultural hegemony and unequal power dynamics which are central to the research questions shaping both Phase One and Two of this project, considering the ways in which process drama and playmaking

can serve as vehicles for implementing elements of best practice in multicultural education, and challenge the ideological constructions which support existing hegemonic dynamics. The focus of data analysis in this chapter is on the ways in which the community in this drama class interacts with the students' engagement with ideas of hegemony, unequal distribution of resources and unequal power dynamics, and their subsequent demonstration of understanding in these areas.

This chapter includes a more detailed overview of the project design outlined in Chapter 3 (methodologies), analysis of the data relative to the research questions, a discussion of the outcomes and limitations of the survey data, and my conclusions.

5.2 Project Design

I began with an initial observation of the class to get a sense for the existing social and learning dynamics. I conducted a survey designed to establish students' ideas about power, including their sense of themselves as powerful at home, school and in the workplace, their belief in power as mutable, and their understanding of the connection between money and power. I designed a series of process drama lessons to 1) establish some baseline understandings of the students' held ideas about power and introduce them to the process drama form, 2) to introduce a consideration of unequal power dynamics as reflected in worker-owner conflicts from the past via the Ludlow Massacre, 3) to explore more contemporary examples of worker-owner conflicts which, in two cases, resulted in collective action which had successful outcomes, and 4) to explore the connection of these ideas to the employment dynamics faced by students and their parents in the community in which they live. The classes were designed by me and taught

primarily by Amy, their theatre teacher, though I occasionally asked a question, played a role, or facilitated their scene development.

The series of lessons began with a process drama which was adapted from an original drama by Jonothan Neelands. Beginning with a picture of 6-year-old Martin Ward perched on the edge of a high balcony about to jump, the implementation of this lesson spanned two class periods and asked students to create the conditions of Martin's life which would put him "on the edge" at age 29. Students created tableaux of Martin's life at ages 7 and 17, with his family, friends, at school, and in his community, brought the images to life as scenes, identified the power dynamics involved in each moment, and created a sociopoem of lines which would live in Martin's head as he climbed onto the balcony. Finally, they identified the elements in his life which were holding him back from jumping. The lesson ended with a discussion about power and how Martin might have reclaimed his power in each situation. (for the full text of these lessons, see Appendix G, p. 354)

The second component addressed the Ludlow Massacre. This component extended across 5 class periods, and included several game-based warm-ups designed to explore various dynamics of power and powerlessness, wealth and poverty, and hope and fear. Students were introduced to the key players in the strike, including immigrant coal miners, mine owner John Rockefeller, Jr., union activists, strike breakers, State Militia members, and National Guard troops. Working from images and primary source text, students used tableau, sculpting, scene work, and movement to explore the dynamics of the miners' and Rockefeller's lives (with a focus on the poverty and forced choices of the former and the wealth of the latter), and to depict the series of events which lead to the

strike, the escalation of violence on both sides, and its eventual tragic outcome in the suffocation and burning of eleven children and two adults. (for the full text of these lessons, see Appendix G, p.356)

The third component of the series, which extended across 3 class periods, returned the students' consideration of power to the present, initially through a lesson which looked at the power dynamics that inform their lives, and the parallels between them and the situation faced by the miners in 1914. Students then explored more contemporary examples of collective action which were successful (the Delano Grape Strike of 1965 and a strike in the North Carolina poultry industry in 1987), and the labor dynamics facing teenagers in the fast food industry (which account for the greatest number of work injuries to teens in any industry in the U.S.). Utilizing primary source images and text, students explored each industry through three perspectives- owners, site managers, and workers- and created movement pieces to music demonstrating the tensions and conflict between those perspectives. Each piece of music was selected to reflect the industry under consideration. (for the full text of these lessons, see Appendix, p.367)

The fourth and final component, a 2 class sequence, asked students to explore the industries present in their own community, and to identify the labor dynamics present for the primarily immigrant population of Chelsea. After selecting an industry, students were given sections of the poem *La Causa* by César Chávez and were asked to create a short scene, with or without words, which might cause someone to write those lines about that industry. These were performed with Puerto Rican music with a mambo rhythm. (for the full text of these lessons, see Appendix, p. 375)

The students completed a post-project survey which repeated the items on the pre-project survey, with the addition of an open prompt: Name anything new you understand about power after this project. The project ended with a discussion, in which students were asked to name anything they liked about the project, anything they disliked about the project, and one thing that would stick with them from the project.

5.3 The Pre-Project Observation

The class with which Phase One was conducted consisted of 24 students- 4 seniors, 6 juniors, 7 sophomores, and 7 freshmen- spanning the four years of high school and ranging in age from 14-19. There were 15 girls and 9 boys representing a wide range of races and ethnicities- primarily Hispanic, with 2 Pan-Asian students, 2 Black students, and 2 White students. The degree of theatre knowledge and experience among the students varied substantially. Three students had taken a drama class before (one of these was also involved in after school plays), four had taken dance classes at the high school level, and the rest were taking their first high school theatre class. The students represented a broad range of academic capabilities as well, from academically successful to those on Individualized Education Plans, indicating a range of learning issues for which specific accommodations must be made. Four students were relatively recent immigrants who spoke English as a second language.

I observed F Block (the period during which the class met every day) for three class periods before introducing them to the project. During this period, I was introduced to them, learned their names, and watched a series of classes which included games, tableaux, and scenes about power. The subject of these

scenes indicated some of their thinking/conceptualizing about power. I also observed their facility with drama forms, their social dynamics, their relationship to the teacher, Amy, and their commitment to the class. I selected F Block for the project because they demonstrated a strong sense of community, a positive relationship with Amy, and a range of drama/theatre knowledge and capability. I will discuss the pre-project observation data in relation to 1) classroom community, 2) student constructions of power as demonstrated in their scenes and interpersonal dynamics, and 3) demonstrations of community and power as discussed in the literature review.

5.3.1 Classroom Community

The students in F Block consistently demonstrated a strong sense of community both verbally and physically throughout the classes I observed. They touched without hesitation, and both boys and girls held hands during warm-up games without hesitation, jokes or comments. This was unusual in the noticeably homophobic environment of the school, in which openly gay students are often harassed in the halls and cafeteria, and homophobic remarks can be heard directed at the members of the Gay-Straight Alliance who have an information table in the cafeteria. Throughout the games they played cooperatively, even during high energy competitive games. There was no cheating and no arguing. During tableau and scene development they worked collaboratively, sharing leadership. The power of the high-status junior and senior boys was enacted in mostly pro-social ways. Luis and Fernando would periodically attempt to alter games, Luis trying to change the rules and Fernando sauntering and taunting playfully. Armando, too, would take power occasionally.

However, the more knowledgeable, higher status students encouraged less able peers in kind ways, and students actively made efforts to include quieter members of the class. In the following excerpt, Karen, a high status junior girl, reached out to Stephanie, a recent immigrant and one of the quietest sophomores in the group.

5.1 Karen: (to Stephanie) “Can I borrow your bookbag? I don’t have one. Do you? Can I borrow it?”

Stephanie: “Yes.”

K: “Where you from? Where you comin’ from?”

S: “Honduras.”

K: “For real?”

S: “I’m from ? (town in Honduras).”

Pause.

K: You live _____, right?”

S: (nods) “Where you from?”

K: “I’m Honduran! I’m from (town in Honduras).”

S: “Really?” (moment of connection)

Karen continued to direct comments to Stephanie periodically throughout the rest of the class. Amy modeled and reinforced this behavior. When Stephanie’s group got on stage to perform, Amy said, “You’ll need to stop talking. This is a quiet group.” The students stopped talking, listened attentively, and applauded heartily at the end.

Amy was included in the community of the classroom. She was playful and funny with the students, and they with her. The following excerpt is typical of the joking way she interacted with the upperclassmen.

5.2 Amy: “Somebody different want to start this time?”

Fernando’s hand goes up.

Amy: “Somebody different.”

Fernando: “I’m different.”

Amy: “I know you are.”

She laughs and so does he.

She talked casually with them about their lives in a way that created a social feel to the interactions, and she communicated trust in their abilities and presented work stating that they would be able to do it. The students actively recruited and pursued contact with her, inviting her to partner with them in games and asking for her help when they got stuck in a task.

The students were similarly welcoming to me during the pre-project observation. For example, Erica sat next to me in the auditorium, introduced herself and asked for my name. Then, when I was learning their names, Armando told me his name was Pete and laughed heartily when I busted him for it. This became a running joke with him throughout the project.

The communal behavior of the students during the pre-project observation indicates their Sense of Community (SOC) as defined by Sarason (1986), providing a readily available, supportive, and dependable structure, characterized by belonging, connectedness, and influence (McMillan and Chavis, 1986).

5.3.2 Student Constructions of Power

During the three classes, students were initially charged with creating 3 power scenes with escalating levels of challenge: 1) 1-line each, establishing who, what, where and relationship, 2) lines establishing a power dynamic, and 3) showing an imbalance of power. In their initial scenes they created images of power from their lives, including a fist fight in the cafeteria, a food fight, a McDonald's worker spitting in a customer's food, and kids throwing food at a movie. These became more sophisticated and multi-layered in their second incarnation, with interpersonal status dynamics added and females depicted as the powerful players in all of the scenes. On the third day, the stock market crash which had occurred the week before was the subject of conversation. The students' level of knowledge about how this might impact them was fairly sophisticated, as this excerpt from the conversation indicates.

5.3 Armando: "We might go into a recession. Might."

Luis: "The stock market dropped like 700 points."

Armando: "My job is already going down. They cut my hours."

Karen (to Mo, ironically): "American?"

Both laugh.

All of the students involved in the conversation are immigrants, and Armando has a full time job in a union shop. Their insight regarding this situation stands in interesting juxtaposition to the "kid" nature of the scene work.

Pursuant to this conversation, and in response to the interest of the students, the focus of the scenes was altered to look at the way money and power

interact. Students created scenes depicting money as a source of basic needs (food, shelter, security), of technology, of mobility and recreation, and of consuming. In one scene, the conflict over resources broke the community of the family in the scene. In the remaining five scenes, the family stayed together through the loss of status, their belongings, and their home. I suggest that this may reflect the community orientation of the group and their cohesion as a class.

5.3.3 Community and Power

The students in F Block functioned well with the theatre tasks. The range of skills among the students did not inhibit the planning and presentation of scenes or their participation in games. They participated fully and quickly and took big risks. While doing an Energy Circle, in which a sound and movement is passed around the group, the junior and senior boys encouraged one another to do bold movements and sounds, and the social leader of the girls was among the biggest risk-takers in the game. The students consistently helped each other and reached out to one another in games. Further, they were able to ask Amy for help in creating scenes when they needed it and politely refused her help when they didn't.

The positive social dynamic of this class seemed to facilitate their function with the drama and theatre work. Amy commented on the fact that the leadership of the class was provided by the more competent students, as opposed to the more popular ones. In moving from the observations of regular class lessons to the process dramas designed for the project, F Block's strengths seemed to be their strong sense of community, their trust of Amy and each other, and their willingness to take risks in completing assigned tasks.

5.4 Pre-Project Survey

The pre- and post-project surveys were not particularly illuminating. Though there were statistically significant shifts on a number of items, including “I am a powerful person,” “Anyone can make change in the world if they try,” “I think this country is working fine the way it is,” “I like feeling powerful,” and “Most people with power are born with it,” (see Table 5.1, p.163) the brief open-prompt made me aware that the students’ interpretation of the items was quite variable. This helped explain some anomalies in responses. For example, several students rated two apparently opposing statements as equally true: “People have more power when they work together” and “People have more power when they work alone.” There were unexpected variations when a similar idea was presented in an “I” statement and a “People” statement; e.g. “I feel most powerful when I am working together with others” and “People have more power when they work together,” which were rated as strongly disagree and strongly agree respectively by several respondents.

A typical example of a puzzling disconnect between the item responses and students’ open responses came from Silvia, who strongly agreed with the statement “Money is the most important tool for gaining power,” but included the following explanation in the open prompt:

5.4 “In this survey it asks if money is an important tool for power and I disagree. I think is (sic) Education honestly.”

Given the range of reading levels in the class, the issues of second language speakers, and the variety of cultures represented, as well as the small

5.5 Coding Categories

Data collected, coded, and analyzed include my daily field notes and post-class reflections, the daily field notes and reflections/comments of the ethnographer, notes on conversations/discussions with the classroom teacher, and the students' post-project discussion and open response prompts from the survey. (for a sample of coded cooked/raw data, see Appendix A, p.338) The coding categories discussed in this analysis include:

- Baseline ideas about power
- Awareness of immigrant factor and poverty in cultural hegemony, past and present
- Understanding of collective power
- Belief in possible efficacy of collective action
- Community in the drama class
- Community and power

I also attempted to code the data for anti-community and belief in the fairness of the current free market employment system. Neither category yielded convincing outcomes. In the case of the free market system, there was virtually nothing, in spite of the fact that students were encouraged to explore and depict multiple perspectives in each of the work conflicts they explored. In coding for anti-community, even considering this category through the broadest possible lens (students taking sick days, occasional disagreement about how a game should go, discussion about scene structure) there is limited coding for anti-community in this group. Luis and Stephanie are responsible for much of it; Luis because he goes his own way frequently, even though he was clearly an integrated and high status group member, and Stephanie because she is unusually shy and withdrawn,

even when Karen reached out to her. Jeffrey and Lawson, two students who refused to participate in the class for the entire semester (discussed below), appear in this category and account for many of the anti-community codings, as well.

5.6 Baseline Constructions about Power

When asked directly to define power during the beginning of the first day of Phase One, the students answered with control, respect, violence, male power, and females as powerful only in caretaking roles (family, offices).

5.5 Silvia: “Control.”

Fernando: “I’ll kill you if you don’t do what I want.”

Mo: “Respect.”

Fernando: “Maybe people respect you if you have power. People want to be like you if you have power...”

Jacky: “So maybe they can get more power, too.”

Erica: “Males have more power because more people listen to them.” She talks about the role of men across history, and their power.

I ask if there’s any place that women have more power.

Jacky: “In the home...”

Noemi: “In offices...Where women are in charge.”

As the process dramas moved into an exploration of the miner’s lives and Rockefeller’s life, women’s sexual power was raised, as was physical strength as a way of being powerful.

5.6 Fernando: “They have the most power because they’re strong. Miners have strength because they work underground.”

They also identified the trappings of status as power markers as represented by the head of the Militia’s (Carl Linderfelt’s) black horse, Rockefeller’s home and belongings, and the cultural opportunities he could offer his children, reflecting their understanding of what Bourdieu (1993) calls “the totally real effects of symbolic power” (p.126).

In moving into the scenario about Martin, a six-year-old Black boy, their answers became more complex. They identified the power of abuse in shaping a person’s life in the family scene, the power of choice in the friends’ scene, the power of revenge in the school scene, the power to resist drugs in the community scene, and the power of rejection in the world scene. These were reflected in interesting ways as they debated Martin’s suicide attempt. Particularly interesting was a discussion about whether Martin’s intended suicide was a powerful or powerless act:

5.7 Karen: (Powerless) “He doesn’t have any power against himself.”

Silvia: (Powerless) “...no strength to live.”

Armando: (Powerless) “The world has the power over him.”

Luis: (Powerful) “Because he can decide whether to live or die.”

Tamar: (Powerful) “Because he has the right to make the biggest decision.”

Bonnie: (Powerless) “By the time he got to the edge, he didn’t have any power anymore.”

From the beginning to the end of the project, the students' beliefs about power were integrated with the importance of community. In group work in the Martin drama, they repeatedly identified Martin's social isolation as key to the despair that eventually motivated his suicide attempt. When asked what the hand holding them back from suicide is, they cited their relationships with family, parents, and siblings.

5.7 Immigrant Status and Poverty as Factors in Cultural Hegemony, Past and Present

According to Freire, an "educational relationship must be based on dialogue among subjects" (Coutinho and Nogueira, 2009, p.173), and "'their active presence in the investigation is more important than the collection of data'" (Freire, 1977, p.122). The process dramas of Phase One were designed to facilitate students' active exploration of ideas of unequal power and its relationship to socioeconomic and cultural factors, or Fraser's (2003) "folk paradigms" of maldistribution and misrecognition (p.12), beginning in the past and moving to their own lives as members of mostly low-income immigrant families. The curriculum established dynamics depicting extremes of wealth and poverty through the Ludlow material, asking students to consider the forced choices and often fatal outcomes facing the mostly immigrant miners and the wealth and power of Rockefeller, who was one of the richest men in the country at that time.

At the start of the unit, students were asked to create living sculptures that depicted "impossibly rich" or "impossibly poor." While some of their choices

were almost comic (a student used as a foot stool, someone eating another person) it was clear that students understood the complexities of wealth and poverty, and the power wielded by the rich. In the following excerpt, students discuss a scene in which two people are eating a third, obviously dead, person:

5.8 “They’re eating Fernando, so they’re poor.”

Mo: “They COULD be rich; they bought Fernando to eat him!”

Armando: “They have money so they can do whatever they want.”

In another sculpture, one student relaxes with her feet up on another student, demonstrating the artist’s understanding, subsequently discussed, that rich and poor exist in relation to one another.

5.9 Luis: “Tamar is RICH RICH.”

Armando: “Tamar is getting everything.”

Mo: “Bonnie is being used as a foot stool.”

This exploration continued with a discussion of four images- Rockefeller, Mother Jones, Carl Linderfelt (head of the Militia), and the miners, focused on who had the most power. Most agreed it was Rockefeller, arguing Rockefeller’s obvious aristocratic bearing:

5.10 A’lisa: “His face looks powerful.”

“He looks sophisticated.”

or Linderfelt:

5.11 Luis: “He’s the leader of the parade. In front of everyone.”

Carlos: “Because his head is held high.”

Luis: “He has a black horse. Everyone else has a brown horse.”

Mo: “He’s the leader.”

Two students chose Mother Jones, a union activist, identifying her possible wealth as a factor in her power, and Carlos identified the experience of her age.

5.12 Bonnie: “She’s old. She’s well-dressed.”

Noemi: “She may know a lot.”

“She looks wealthy.”

Silvia: “She looks like Queen Elizabeth.”

Consideration of who had the most power was expanded as they created the conditions of the miners’ lives and Rockefeller’s life. Based on photos and a list of quotes, the students created scenes in which Rockefeller did little but order others around, sleep and have sex. He also abused his servant, and his home and his children’s lives were reflective of his immense wealth.

5.13 Amy: “What did you notice about Rockefeller’s work?”

Mo: “He does nothing.”

Luis: “He just waits until they die and then replaces them with other people.”

Bonnie: “I can imagine him just drinking, counting money, and getting laid.”

Their scenes of the miners were very family-focused. The students depicting miners were physically close, huddling together and hugging each other good-bye as the 13-year-old son left their shack for his mining job. The post-scene discussion identified their understanding of the difference in the socioeconomic circumstances of Rockefeller’s and the miners’ lives.

5.14 Bonnie: “The rich people get education.”

Mo: “Money gets you power.”

Amy: “You think money is power? What does money get you?”

Luis: “Everything!”

Amy: “How was that different than the miners?”

Karen: “They didn’t HAVE a home.”

A’lisa: “They had leaks, no one to clean up after them.”

Bonnie: “They were in newspaper houses basically.”

Silvia: “I think the basement of their (Rockefellers’) house is like the miner’s house.”

The following discussion asked them to synthesize their lived experiences and understandings with the material they had just explored and created as scenes. These facts were not explicitly included in the Ludlow material, but it seems possible that their understandings were informed by their own socioeconomic levels and the fact that many of them work 25-40 hours per week.

5.15 Bethany: “Given these pictures, why would there be conflict between rich and poor?”

Fernando: “The rich are taking advantage of the poor people.”

Erica: “It’s hard for the poor people to climb higher because there aren’t opportunities...”

Bethany: “Why is there conflict then?”

Erica: “The poor people are going to try and do something about it to make things better...”

Armando: “The poor people want to be paid better. They can’t go anywhere.”

Bethany: “Why would the rich people have a conflict with the poor?”

Estefania: “Because they want them to work harder for less money.”

During the transition from their countries of origin (done in a visualization which asked them first to imagine their homes and share details of their surroundings) students were very focused on the poverty of their homes of origin, citing rats, dripping ceilings, etc. These may have been informed by the miners’ scenes from the previous class. The visualization then takes them to Colorado, a cold, smoky, polluted, depressed area. A recruiter for the mines (Teacher in Role) lures them with promises of well-paid jobs, homes, food, safety, and education for their children. As he speaks, the students move forward from their line against the wall when they are ready to accept the offer. Some students moved forward at the promise of a “better life for you and your kids” (1), the ability to “buy whatever you want” (4), reassurance that mining is safer than working on the railroad (1)

and that their children will be kept safe (6). All students but one moved forward twice, once when promised a house to live in and again when assured of an education for their children. Only a senior girl stayed against the wall. In discussion, students reflected their understanding that the immigrants ultimately didn't have a choice about whether or not to stay. It was stipulated in the guided visualization that they had spent the last of their money to get to Colorado, and they spoke about being trapped as a result. They had a realistic perspective of what the miners' houses looked like and the dangerous nature of the jobs, as they had depicted them in scene work the day before in scenes of a 13-year-old boy heading off to work in the mines, families huddled together in newspaper shacks with dripping roofs, and a scene of a fatal mine cave-in.

In discussion, students identified the forced choice with which the immigrants were confronted.

5.16 Amy: "So why would they stay there and take those jobs? Why wouldn't they leave?"

Silvia: "That was the only job they could get."

Karen: "There's no choice!"

Francisco: "They're scared."

Amy: "Why did some of you move forward?"

Silvia: "Cause they've got schools."

Carlos: "A lot of other people were doing it so it seemed like the right thing to do."

Bonnie: "They're paying fairly well, and it would support my kids."

Jacky: “There’s no money to get food, but they’ll give it to you and shelter.”

Tamar, a senior girl who held a 40-hour/week union job at a grocery store, was the only hold-out. When asked why she hadn’t moved forward, she answered,

5.17 “Everything she offered for free, you had to pay back. So people from another country who don’t understand what credit is wouldn’t understand that they would be in debt before they even start to work!”

The choice between a bad job and no job is a choice that confronts many Chelsea residents today, as was demonstrated in a later section of the process drama.

According to the Executive Office of Labor and Workforce Development of Massachusetts, the three largest employers in Chelsea are Johnnie’s Foodmaster, (a local supermarket), the Mass Water Resource Authority (a sewage treatment plant), and Kayem Foods (a meat processing plant). The median income in Chelsea is 41.9% less than the Massachusetts average and 27.6% less than the national average. Further, the poverty level in Chelsea is 202.7% greater than the Massachusetts average and 89.5% greater than the national average. According to government data, the average salary for jobs in Chelsea, Massachusetts is \$26,645, and according to City Data, the Chelsea city information site, the median household income for 2009 was \$41,910.

This example of students applying their current experience to the situation in Ludlow in 1914 first came up when discussing what a recruiter does. Silvia

drew a parallel with her lived experience at the high school, which has Army recruiters posted in the cafeteria during every lunch period. They actively recruit students who are about to graduate or who are at risk of failing out of school.

5.18 Silvia: “It’s like when the Army comes to recruit us; they want us to join and tell us the reasons why.”

Given that the United States is at war in two countries (which makes promises of job training and travel less appealing) and that the commitment is legally binding, balanced against a dearth of options due to poverty, lack of legal immigration status (which makes federal loans inaccessible for college), and a legacy of low-paying blue collar jobs in Chelsea, this seems an apt comparison. Further, the whole group exchanged looks of disgust in response to the Recruiter’s promise to “speak slowly” to those who speak English as a second language. This was discussed later as a frequent occurrence in their lives, as immigrants and children of immigrants, in school and in the community.

Students further demonstrated their understanding of the negative outcomes of becoming a miner in the warm-up which began the next day’s work, in which half of the class was charged with creating a living sculpture of the miners’ greatest hopes and the other half with depicting their greatest fears. The greatest hopes depicted money, food, a car, peace, proper tools, and knowledge. The fears included death, hunger, suffocation, dragging dead bodies, mine collapse, injury, and the futility of escape.

Students were introduced to the strike and the violence that began to accompany it. In discussion, the students identified the reasons for escalating

violence, given the situation in which the miners were living, in tents in the Colorado winter with four feet of snow on the ground. They identified as factors the frustration experienced by the miners, the cold, their hunger, the lack of progress in the strike, and their lack of options.

5.19 Amy: “How do you think it got to the point where people were being killed?”

Luis: “It made people change.”

Erica: “There was no way to escape.”

Fernando: “They weren’t getting anywhere.”

Karen: “They went mad.”

Each student selected the side s/he would represent in the final confrontation of the strike, which involved militia in machine gun nests surrounding the tent colony and firing into the tents in which women and children were living. The males in the class initially chose to be militia members, but eventually Fernando and Francisco opted to join the tent colony with their close female friends, Joanne and Karen. Amy reported hearing students saying, ‘Family or guns? Family or guns?’ as they tried to choose a side. Bonnie was undecided, and the highest status males in the class, Armando, Luis, and Mo, encouraged her to join the militia, arguing for the wealth and status of the militia as reasons for joining, and citing the poverty of the miners.

5.20 Luis: “What do you want? To be a dirty miner or have money and guns?”

In the discussion afterwards, the students identified the types of power held by the groups involved in the Ludlow Massacre. Again, guns and money were identified as central to the power of the militia. Linderfelt, as a representative of that sector, was identified as having the power of the miners' fear of him. Students identified the miners' power as rooted in their force of will and in their relationships.

5.21 Amy: "What types of power did they have?"

Karen: "Willpower."

Luis: "Power of love for family."

Jacky: "Power of survival."

5.7.1 Discussion: Ludlow

According to Heathcote (2008), the goal of drama is to "show change" as "it freezes a problem in time, and you examine the problem as the people go through a process of change" (2009, p.200). She identifies the importance of the interaction between participants and material, in which "you must accept that you are going to use human material, not fancy ideas, not cool abstractions of facts... So, it is your human material and their human material that is going to somehow come together" (p.202). She identifies the process as "fighting for form to give shape to these ideas so that... there is more reflective energy available in your group of students" (p.202). Greene (1995), on exploring others' stories and realities, cites the importance of extending "our experience sufficiently to grasp it as a human possibility" (p.4), thereby giving ourselves "opportunities to choose ourselves as persons of integrity, persons who care" (p.127).

In their exploration of the Ludlow Massacre material, the students were able to reflect on the misrecognition and maldistribution that informed and inflamed the situation, to put themselves in the roles of those involved, and begin to draw parallels between their own socioeconomic positions and those of the miners. Throughout the drama work, and particularly in the final confrontation, students explored power, both the physical and material strength of Rockefeller and the militia members and the social, community-based power of the miners.

5.7.2 Contemporary Labor Issues

The process drama transitioned to more contemporary labor issues, including the Delano Grape Strike of 1965-69, a successful 1987 strike by workers in the chicken processing industry in North Carolina, and the employment abuses and injury rate reflected in the fast food industry. Students were charged with identifying the wage differences and job tasks of those at three different levels of employment—workers, managers and owners. They created scenes and a movement piece that demonstrated the socioeconomic dynamics of the three levels, as well as the nature of the work tasks and on-the-job injuries.

There were a number of parallels between the students' depictions of Rockefeller in the initial scenes establishing his life and depictions of the behavior of owners in the contemporary scenes about the poultry industry.

5.22 Jacky: "Me and Tracy are going to have our feet up."

Tracy: "Yeah, since we're lazy."

- 5.23 Armando (to Heba): “I’ll be on the phone. On my cell. I don’t have time for anyone.” (Armando and Heba talk repetitively on their phones, legs up, working on their calculators.)

In one particularly telling moment, Jacky incorporated the financial inequity established in the mining work:

- 5.24 Tracy: “This money is for the workers, this is for the vendors. What do we do with the rest?”

They look at each other and then Tracy and Jacky pocket the leftover money.

Jacky: “I owe you people three hundred, you two hundred, and you ten? Great. Bye.”

This parallel extended to the behavior of the site managers as well. As in the scenes depicting 1914, the managers were the active enforcers of the owner’s profit motivation, and the violence towards workers depicted in those scenes was mirrored in the contemporary scenes.

- 5.25 Bonnie and Mo are managers.

Mo: “What did you say?!” (punches Luis.)

After Luis gets fired, Bonnie says, “Now hiring!”

Silvia: “Bonnie and Tamar, we’ll yell at them.”

The workers were consistently depicted as low income and the behaviors reflected in the scene and movement pieces demonstrated a brutal disregard for workers' needs. For example, in Excerpt 5.25, Fernando and Luis called Mo a bitch in Spanish and complained about work. Mo then punched Luis and fired him. The accidents experienced by the workers resulted in their reprimand or dismissal in each case, and in the chicken factory scene, two workers quit in outrage over their treatment, but the third sighed deeply and continued with her work. Students identified the power dynamics in play afterwards, and used their held knowledge of the dynamics depicted in the Burger King (fast food industry) scenes in discussion.

5.26 Amy: "The grape pickers struck, and the chicken workers struck. Why didn't BK strike?"

Luis: "The company is just too powerful."

Jacky: "They can easily get people to replace them."

Bonnie: "Teenagers need to keep those jobs."

Students were also able to connect the issues facing workers in the contemporary scenes with dynamics facing their parents in their jobs.

5.27 Silvia: "My Mom works in a factory here in Chelsea. It's kind of like the chicken plant- they don't want you to go to the bathroom and stuff."

The final piece of the process drama brought questions of immigration, poverty, and power into the present in their environment. Students were asked to

identify the industries in Chelsea which provide employment for immigrants, undocumented immigrants, and poor people. They had an impressive breadth of knowledge, naming food service, restaurants, supermarkets, meat factories, meat packaging, leather tanning, produce wholesalers, Department of Public Works (mostly street cleaners) and social work as employment industries. In small groups assigned to represent these various industries, students were given a section of the text of *La Causa*, a poem by César Chávez (see Appendix G, p.375-6). Their task was to create a short scene with or without words that might cause someone to write those lines about the industry for which their group was responsible. Their section of text had to be read, either during the piece or after it and a selection of Puerto Rican mambo music would be played as each piece was performed.

After reading the poem aloud, Amy asked what Chávez had seen that might make him write, “We are men and women who have suffered and endured much.” In their responses, students demonstrated their understanding of some of the challenges facing poor and immigrant workers.

5.28 Silvia: “Workers didn’t have no benefits, no health insurance.”

Jacky: “No education for the kids.”

The scenes created reflected the power and socioeconomic dynamics of the earlier process work, as well as recognition of the language and culture differences between owners and workers. The students chose to use the hierarchy from the previous class two days earlier, depicting owners, managers and workers in their scenes, and included elements from that work, including manager/worker

conflicts, physical and verbal assaults, and injuries, as this excerpt describing one of the scenes demonstrates.

5.29 Erica as manager. Jacky running back and forth- she falls. Erica screams at everyone to work faster. Bonnie only speaks Spanish- confronts Erica.

“I want more money (in Spanish).”

Erica: “I can’t understand you.”

Slaps her. Knocks her down and kicks her.

Jacky takes her job.

In another scene, the way in which dependence on the job opens workers to exploitation, initially explored in the Ludlow material, was revisited in a contemporary setting.

5.30 Tamar: “I have to get my daughter. I don’t have anyone to baby sit.”

Silvia: “Am I supposed to care?”

Tamar: “No.”

Silvia: “So you’ll stay.”

Tamar: “Yes.”

Silvia goes down the line and pressures everyone else to stay, one by one.

Silvia: (to Adolfo) “Don’t you need the money?”

Adolfo: “Yes.”

In a brief discussion after the presentation of the scenes, students defended the realism of their depictions.

5.31 Amy: “Do people really talk to each other that way?”

(There is a chorus of “Yes!”)

Amy: “Why?”

Silvia: “To humiliate them.”

Amy: “What are the similarities and differences between these industries?”

Karen: “Immigrants.”

Silvia: “And the bosses are really careless about their workers happiness.”

In the post-project surveys, in response to the prompt, “Name anything new you understand about power after this project,” students wrote about the interaction of power and money which were reflected in their scene work during the project.

5.32 DeeDee: “That most people have power only because they have what other people want.”

Francisco: “That usually people used fear and money to get power.”

Jacky: “After this project I started to think that power does have to do with having money. Throughout this project the people with money had power over the poor. I noticed that the poor had no money and no power.”

In the final discussion, when asked to name one thing they would remember from the project, students explicitly identified the connection between immigrants and poor working conditions, as the following excerpt demonstrates.

- 5.33 Jacky: “How companies treat people. I go to Burger King and buy chicken.”
- Erica: “How people shot the miners. It was cold. How they treated people.”
- Heba: “How they treated poor people.”
- Armando: “Violence. How they got treated.”
- Karen: “How people get treated at these jobs. Especially immigrants.”
- Tracie: “The desperation of the people that they would just take that job.”
- Tamar: “How another group of people were discriminated against, not just black people.”
- Francisco: “How badly they needed the jobs.”
- Silvia: “Not just the immigrants, but the poor people had to stay in bad situations for the money.”
- Stephanie: “How they treated poor people.”

Freire (1985) advocates that the oppressed must “achieve a deepening awareness both of their social cultural reality that shapes their lives and their capacity to transform that reality” (p.93). In moving the students’ exploration into a consideration of contemporary labor dynamics, students were able to identify and depict in scene work the connection between unequal power dynamics and cultural hegemony, immigrant status and poverty, which inform their lives and the life of their community. Further, they were able to discuss it and identify its importance in the lives of workers in the past and present.

5.8 Collective Action

A component of the process drama curriculum focused on the idea of collective action as a tool for social change for workers. Data coded for 1) understanding of collective power and 2) belief in the efficacy of collective action offers a sense of students' emerging understandings across the period of the project. The idea of collective action was introduced via the Ludlow coal miners' strike in 1914. Students' responses in the following excerpt demonstrate their early understandings.

5.34 Amy: "What does it mean to go on strike?"

Karen: "Not working for a while."

Estefania: "Protest. About something you don't like."

Karen: "You get all the workers together. To say how they feel."

Armando: "They don't let anyone take their jobs away."

Jacky: "They want better hours, and better jobs."

Mo: "More money, too."

During the next class period, students played a warm-up game, a variation on Rock-Paper-Scissors designed to introduce a consideration of different types of power in three groups in the Colorado coal strike. The militia was represented by a machine gun, the miners were represented by a pick-ax, and Mother Jones was represented by a wagging finger. In this version, machine gun beats pickax, pickax beats finger, and finger beats gun. Initially, students mocked the idea of the wagging finger as a "weapon," but as the game proceeded, the machine gun

was defeated by the wagging finger in 5 rounds. Luis, one of the most vociferous early mockers, stated:

5.35 Luis: "I hate that machine gun. It's good for NOTHIN'!"

In a subsequent conversation regarding the power that each group had, Luis was able to identify the power of the 'wagging finger' of Mother Jones.

5.36 Luis: "She had control over the people by encouraging the people to stay. The power of encouragement."

The students, in setting up their tent colony for the final confrontation between strikers and militia, demonstrated their awareness for the need for solidarity.

5.37 Silvia: "This is my land. You get your own land. We can't be fighting over land."

Fernando: "We're living together. It has to be cooperative."

The climax of the Ludlow Strike resulted in the deaths of thirteen people, 11 of them children, suffocated and burned in a trench when the tent above them was doused in coal oil and set ablaze. The tide of public opinion turned against Rockefeller for this action and the National Guard was removed, however the strike was effectively quashed, and the miners returned to work under the same conditions that had caused them to strike. In discussion afterwards, the students

were asked if the collective action was a good thing or a bad thing. Their responses were marked by pragmatism, but also reflected an understanding of the costs and rewards for both sides.

5.38 Noemi: “They needed the support of someone with money.”

Luis: “It depends on whose side you’re on. If you’re a striker, it’s bad.

‘Cause you saw all your work and nothing came from it. You’re still doing the same job in the same conditions. If you’re militia, it’s good. You’re getting paid, and it’s not that much work to shoot someone.”

The question of the efficacy of collective action and striking was revisited as the process dramas moved into more contemporary events in California and North Carolina. After introducing the material, the students played a game of Hen, Fox and Chicks as a warm-up. In this game, the Mother Hen and her line of chicks (students with hands on each others’ waists) face the ‘fox,’ who attempts to attempts to eat (tag) the chicks one by one as the Hen protects them. Any chick that becomes separated from the flock is fair game. Afterwards, students discussed the dynamics of the game:

5.39 Karen: “People got better at it.”

Amy: “Why?”

Karen: “They knew what was going on, what to expect. Because they knew what worked and what didn’t work by watching it over and over again.”

and identified parallels between the game strategies and the dynamics in a strike:

5.40 Luis: “You choose the strongest one. They can lead you. They can protect you. Picking the people who can hold on the longest so that they won’t get picked off.”

Fernando: “It’s like war. You go for the leader first. If you can get him, the rest of the group will fall apart.”

Their discussion demonstrated an emerging understanding of the dynamics of collective action. Saxton and Prendergast (2009) believe that “the act of simply thinking about something with other people can enable insights into things that were not apparent while inside the experience; when reflection happens together, shared insights deepen and extend that experience” (p.203). This seemed to be a dynamic in the development of student understandings in this section, as more experienced students shared their understandings with their less knowledgeable peers. At the end of the project, Amy asked them what they knew about unions. Several students already belonged to unions at their full time jobs, and had a fairly sophisticated level of understanding, which they shared with the group.

5.41 Armando: “I’m in a union. I’m in a cleaning company. Not every company has one, but if yours does, you get a lot of benefits from it. Like if they cut your hours or something, the union will fight for you.”

Tamar talked about her job at Stop and Shop, where the site managers are in the same union as the workers. “They don’t have the power to fine you or suspend you because they’re in the same union.”

Armando talked about the way companies get rid of you if they want to. “They make up some reason and get you to sign a piece of paper saying you did it. So if the union comes in they show them the paper and say, ‘See. He signed this.’ They can get rid of you.”

When polled, all of the students said they would join a union except Luis, who said he wouldn’t join the union because he wouldn’t want to pay the money.

Students’ understandings of the dynamics of collective action and the role of collective action in fostering social change in job settings was addressed specifically in the short writing prompt at the end of the post-project survey. The prompt, “Name anything new you understand about power after this project,” generated a range of answers about the possibilities and limitations of collective action. These are transcribed as written.

5.42 Luis: Power is either earned or given you can make changes with power and the power that you have affect others around you

Silvia: Something new I now know about power is it hasn’t been fair for years who gets the power. In this survey it asks if money is an important tool for power and I disagree I think is Education honestly. But these days it is possible to have power if you are a minority you just have to stick to your goals.

A'lisa: That anyone, well almost anyone can do anything they want to if they believe in themselves and have good effer [effort] and not give up on themselves.

Erica: What I learned is how if you protest sometimes you could make a difference. And some people (anyone) can change the world if they try.

Tracy: I understand that you don't need money to have more power, and that if you try hard enough you can change the world or influence others.

Tamar: I think that anyone can achieve power if they make the effort and more importantly have the drive and determination because to achieve the power that you want you have to work at it especially if you are in a set back position. I also believe that even though if one person does not achieve power in their lifetime, it's the gathered effort over time that achieves power for a group of people. Like although many of the miners lost their lives, with their effort miners today have more power because of their efforts.

Heba: I learned that you are only powerful if you have a lot of money.

You cannot be powerful when you are poor.

I find it interesting that the same experience convinced some students that there is power in numbers, and convinced others that the poor have no power whatsoever.

5.9 Community and Power

As noted in the pre-project observation, the students in F Block demonstrated substantial SOC in the class, and this dynamic was observed consistently throughout the project, interpersonally and in their choices during the drama work. There were many examples of cohesiveness in the group. For example, students, male and female, regularly stood close together and put their arms around each other. During Sociograms (an early warm up), the students grabbed one another and pulled them into their groups. There were several deep connections between students (Fernando and Joanne, Karen and Francisco) who were always together in class but were not couples. Also, the upper grade males in this class had a tight, positive bond. They didn't "cap" on each other (make unkind jokes at each other's expense), and they were supportive and cohesive. They applauded each other's work and that of the other students in the class, both literally and figuratively, demonstrating Communal Power Orientation (CPO) as they used their elevated social position for the good of the group (Chen, Lee-Chai and Bargh, 2001).

CPO was demonstrated throughout the project by the students who regularly provided caretaking for each other. For example, during the chicken factory piece, Bonnie, who is a vegetarian and a member of PETA, explained her perspective to the others in her group. Silvia's concerned response was typical.

- 5.43 Silvia: “Bonnie, are you going to be alright doing a movement where you’re working with chickens, because of the PETA thing? Are you sure?”

In speed sculpting, students chose a range of people to include, not just their friends, and Amy reinforced this by acknowledging their positive behavior.

- 5.44 Amy: “I like that you’re asking people to help who haven’t been used yet. Good.”

The students have a good relationship with Amy, and they care what she thinks of them. Both their community orientation and their respect for Amy were apparent in a discussion after a game of Blind Car (Boal, 2002), in which students steered each other around the stage by touch.

- 5.45 Amy: “In your lives, who steers you?”

Fernando: “Self.”

Mo: “My mom, my parents.”

Karen: “My niece, she’s younger, she’s only 2.”

Mo: “Ms. C.”

A’lisa: “My best friend.”

Bonnie: “Mine, too.”

Karen: “It’s better when you have older best friends, because they give you advice about what they did, and they push you to where they didn’t get to.”

Their community orientation was also demonstrated when, during the visualization of their emigration in the Ludlow process drama, they discussed the move from their countries of origin.

5.46 Amy: “What will you miss about your homeland?”

Tracy: “Friends.”

Bonnie: “The culture.”

Karen: “Comfort.”

Erica: “The language.”

Fernando: “Women and family.”

In the recruiter role piece, six students moved forward when the recruiter promised that their families would be safe, and all but one student moved forward when promised an education for their children. In discussion, students identified reasons for moving which reflected their concern with family and community (Excerpt 5.16).

As the Ludlow piece moved towards the climactic violence of the Militia’s attack on the tent colony, the students demonstrated serious commitment to the task and a deep trust in each other as they set up their machine gun nests and created the tent colony using two-by-fours and simple props. The preparations of the families in the tents were simultaneously playful and serious. They set up the pretend environment without a trace of self-consciousness.

5.47 Silvia: “This is my land. You get your own land. We can’t be fighting over land.”

Fernando: “We’re living together. It has to be cooperative.”

Fernando: “Hey! Your house has more angles than ours! That’s not cool!”

Karen: “Look how much room you have! Your house is gigantic!”

5.48 Fernando: “Why is that banana burning?”

Silvia: “That’s our dinner for tonight. That’s all we have.”

Fernando: “That’s our fiber?”

Silvia: “Yes, it’s one peel each. Get ready to eat.”

The preparations of the militia were not playful. From the start they negotiated strategic placement of guns, angles of shot, the need to elevate their position on a riser, etc. However this group, too, lacked any trace of self-consciousness as they used lengths of two-by-four as pretend guns. This is typical of the risk-taking and mutual trust demonstrated by the group members throughout the project.

As we moved toward the moment in which the strikers and their families would be attacked, the students were asked to speak their thoughts, and they expressed concern for each other, even in their fictional roles.

5.49 Karen: “Please don’t let anything happen to my children.”

Silvia: “I thought about leaving, but I don’t want to leave my husband and kids.”

The families made final plans as the group waited for the command to “Fire!”

5.50 Silvia: (to Fernando) “You got to cover Joanne. I’ll cover Deedee.”

In discussing the events of the climax afterwards, students were asked to name the power that the miners had in the situation.

5.51 Luis: “Power of love for family.”

The students’ SOC and CPO were consistently demonstrated in their sharing of leadership during scene development as well. They shared their ideas freely throughout the project, in planning, reflecting on one another’s scenes, and interpreting images and text. There isn’t a single instance of students correcting each other in a demeaning or negative way. The following excerpt, of scene planning in a group with several strong leaders, demonstrates these positive dynamics as the group negotiates, discusses, and compromises, without arguing or bickering. The first excerpt is the discussion which occurred while developing one of the scenes of violence during the Ludlow strike, in which a young boy is shot and killed. The second is the resulting scene.

5.52 Tamar: “I think I’m going to get shot.”

Armando: “I want to use the boat.”

Luis: “I’m about to get shot, too.”

Armando: “Can I be the sniper? I really want to be the shooter.”

Mo: “Is there more than one sniper?”

Luis: “Isn’t it a machine gun IN the car? Not a shotgun?”

Armando: “We can use this big piece of wood. It looks like a shotgun.”

Luis: “You shoot me like this. Like, sneak up on me.”

Armando: “I’m going to make the sound effects.”

Luis: “Oh, oh. We should talk, Tamar. I’ll be like, “What’s that car for?”

And you’ll say, “RUN!” And then we’ll both get shot.”

This planning yielded a devastating and well done scene:

5.53 Group depicts young boy (Luis) getting shot as he plays. Armando and Mo are Death Special drivers; Tamar is Luis’s mother.

Luis: “What’s that car?”

Tamar: “RUN!!!!”

They both get shot down. Then Mo and Armando have a smoke.

In spite of their full lives, the students demonstrated a good degree of retention across multi-day breaks in the unit. When they returned after a day off during the Martin sequence, they still remembered their groups, their initial tableau and their second tableau. Amy was pleased and surprised. Their commitment during the Martin drama culminated in a somber and powerful vox popula moment at the end as the students voiced the thoughts in Martin’s head as he stood on the ledge:

5.54 Tracy: “You’re too dumb to succeed.”

Adolfo: “You have no life.”

Mo: “Get out of here, we don’t need you.”

Joanne: "Why are you so different from us?"

Armando: "You are a nobody in life."

Stephanie: "You failed."

Joselin: "Why would I play with you, you're black."

Tamar: "You're the worst father ever!"

Heba: "You're a nobody."

Erica: "I don't want to marry you."

Luis: "Stop! You can be helped."

A'lisa: "You're all alone in this world."

Francisco: "Your birth was accidental anyways."

Estefania: "I don't love you, why would you think I want your kid?"

Jacky: "She's dead!"

Silvia: "You will always be the same worthless piece of crap."

Deedee: "You aren't worth anything in this world."

Karen: "Your best friend died trying to save you!"

Their ability to commit fully, engage deeply, and explore the material seemed to be facilitated by their trust in each other, "the element absolutely crucial to the operation of any drama in education" (O'Toole, 1992, p.150) and an identified component of SOC (McMillan and Chavis, 1986). They also demonstrated a shared desire to do well. Students asked the more experienced class members for help in improving their scenes. The leaders in the group also coached, encouraged and nudged less committed group members.

5.55 Karen: (to group): “Don’t be in the scene if you’re not going to take it really seriously.”

Given the range of experience and ability in the group, the work produced during this project was surprising in its consistency and quality. An outstanding case in point is the movement to music in the Grape Strike, Chicken Factory and Burger King segments. Their work on these pieces was carefully prepared, well conceived, and performed with commitment. They were really moving for the audience members, and the students were clearly engaged with the material. The students in the Grape Strike scene responded very strongly to the music for their piece, which was a Puerto Rican piece with a mambo rhythm. Erica and Luis, both of whom are Hispanic, and Mo, a recent Somalian immigrant, shared a moment about it, as demonstrated in this excerpt.

5.56 Mo: “What was that?”

Luis: “I liked that. That was Tango.”

Erica: “Mambo.”

Luis: “Oh yes, Mambo. It was Mambo.”

Amy cues Puerto Rican music. Mo cuts a step across the circle. Luis plays air guitar.

Luis: “Oh, it really sucks. Playing this while you’re getting beat.”

Students in other scenes envied the group their music. (The music for the Chicken Factory and the Burger King scenes were Amazing Grace and a muzak version of Torn by Natalie Imbruglia, respectively. They were less enamored of

their selections, though the music seemed to improve the quality of movement in all scenes.) Students in these groups commented on the Grape Pickers' music as well.

5.57 Adolfo: (about PR music) "I like their music." Adolfo starts flipping burgers in time to the music. Smiling.

The music for the Grape Pickers group had such a pronounced effect on their commitment in the scene that we used it in the final pieces about Chelsea industries. I hypothesize that students felt it brought their home culture/community into the classroom, with a resulting impact on their outcomes (Mocclair, 2009; Appadurai, 2004; Rao and Walton, 2004). A similar enthusiasm was demonstrated when Amy read *La Causa* to the students.

5.58 Karen: "That's a good one."

Luis: "Yes!" (He applauds.)

5.10 Negative Cases

An interesting exception to the community of the class is the situation with two of the male students, Jeff and Lawson. They sat in the back of the auditorium for every class and refused to participate for the entire semester, before, during and after this project. Lawson had substantial learning issues and an Individual Education Plan. Jeff sat and read through every class. Amy attempted to include them, and the Principal came in to talk to them as well. Initially, the students also encouraged them to join, but eventually gave up. Jeff and Lawson were engaged

and listening when I learned the students' names, but they wouldn't participate beyond that. After a week, it was as though they weren't in the room. It seemed that, if they didn't want to be part of the community, they were not worth recognition by the other students. As Karen said on the fourth day of the project when I asked Jeff and Lawson if they'd be joining us, "They don't matter."

In an interesting coda, when I handed out the post-project survey to the students, Jeff asked if he could fill one out. For the first time, he got up from his seat, came to get it and then brought it back to me when he completed it. I don't know what his motivation was, but his response to the open prompt demonstrated his understanding of the content of the process drama work we'd done and his awareness of the "message." It said:

5.59 "Just like snowflakes, they are different and unique and just like us if they come together they can be a very strong force and change something."

Why didn't they participate? Was it taking power by resisting (Apple, 1995)? A rejection of the community of the class? Discomfort with the subject? I don't know.

5.11 Limitations of the Analysis

The case study method allows investigators to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real life events (Yin, 2003, p.2).

Arguments over case study validity tend to relate to issues of subjectivity as much as they do the generalisability of findings (Winston, 2006, p.46).

The sheer volume of ethnographic data on this phase of the research made analysis a daunting task, as I struggled to balance the ‘holistic and meaningful characteristics’ of a real life event while still addressing my research questions. The question of subjectivity becomes quite complex when trying to honestly identify “emergent themes” (Winston, 2006, p.58) and still include a full range of voices of the participants, some of whom shared their thoughts verbally, and some of whom enacted them. I make no claims as to the generalisability of these findings. However, I made the most honest choices I could about this group of urban students, in this classroom, at this time, from the hundreds of pages of ethnographic notes provided by me, the outside ethnographer on the project, and the classroom teacher, and the original writings, utterances and performances of the students. I followed Stake’s (1995) advice to “discover essences and then to reveal those essences with sufficient context, yet not become mired trying to include everything that might possibly be described” (p.84).

5.12 Conclusion

Each man, finally...carries on some form of intellectual activity, that is, he is a ‘philosopher’, an artist, a man of taste, he participates in a particular conception of the world, has a conscious line of moral conduct, and therefore contributes to sustain a conception of the world or to modify it, that is, to bring into being new modes of thought (Gramsci, 2009, p.138).

Giroux (1992) suggests that we need to establish a “politics of solidarity” (p.259) in schools, rather than a hierarchy of individual groups and differences,

“engage in cultural remapping” (p. 259) by generating systematic analyses of the way the dominant culture maintains its hegemonic control, and highlight the exploration and understanding of power, which “has to be made central to understanding the effects of difference from the perspective of historically and socially constructed forms of domination” (ibid, p.259). The process drama work undertaken by the students in F Block foregrounded questions of power, as students explored unequal power dynamics and the effects of cultural hegemony on the lives of immigrants and the urban poor, both in the past and present, and the role of collective action as a possible vehicle for modifying those dynamics. Further, the structure of the class and the strategies of applied theatre/drama utilized the students’ strong sense of community and communal power orientation in considering the possibility of change.

Foucault (1984), in discussing the importance of “spaces” between power components as places to think, states, “it is what allows one to step back from this way of acting or reacting, to present it to oneself as an object of thought and question it as to its meanings, its conditions, and its goals...” (p.388), and Freedman (2003) contends that political thought can be unpacked through “empirically observable acts” (p.23). The data analysis of Phase One of the project indicates that process drama work engaged the students around ideas of cultural hegemony, unequal power dynamics, and collective action. They actively engaged with these ideas through a variety of applied theatre/drama forms, demonstrating their emerging ‘political thought’ in action and discussing their ‘thinking’ in post-exercise reflections. Their responses during the final discussion of the project and in the open responses on the post-project survey indicate that even the less verbal

students and those whose facility with English may have limited their participation in discussions had some grasp of the central ideas of the project.

The aspect of the project which is more difficult to communicate is the quality of theatre work generated by the students. In spite of a wide range of competencies and levels of ability, the work generated by the students was often insightful and powerful. The tight-knit community of the group seemed to be a factor in this, as students supported, encouraged, and included each other across grade levels, ethnicities, and skill levels, demonstrating competence as students through the community-rich medium of drama (Nelson, 2011; Gallagher, 2007; Cahill, 2002; Nelson, Colby & McIlrath, 2001; Wagner, 1998; Manley and O'Neill, 1997; Neelands, 1990).

The question raised by these outcomes is, 'now what?' Process drama seems to have facilitated students' understanding of the unequal power dynamics that face immigrants and the poor, circumscribing their options and futures. Students explored, to some extent, the possibility for change through collective action. Is it possible, then, to use drama forms to challenge the ideological framework that supports these hegemonic constructions and help students imagine themselves as agents of change in these dynamics? Further, what effect will the community of the classroom have on that effort? Phase Two of this research addressed these questions through a playmaking project, discussed in the next chapter.

Chapter 6

Data Analysis of Phase Two: Playmaking

6.1 Introduction

This chapter presents analysis of the data collected during Phase Two of my research project, which utilized playmaking to facilitate students' understandings of the ways in which their own experiences of discrimination were reflected in broader societal trends and to facilitate students' identity and skills development as agents of change in these dynamics. For the purposes of this discussion, playmaking refers to the use of a variety of drama/theatre techniques to develop original performance work with students which emphasizes the exploration of their ideas with the goal of developing their voices and visions of the world and bringing them to a broader audience.

The research questions guiding this component of the study were:

- What are the effects of playmaking on facilitating students' understandings of unequal power dynamics, as reflected in cultural hegemony and unequal distribution of resources in their lives?
- What are the effects of using playmaking structures to facilitate students' identity formation as change agents in the issues that affect their lives?
- How can students acquire advocacy skills through participation in a playmaking experience?
- In what ways does the community established in the drama classroom affect students' engagement and facility with the material?

The playmaking process was intended to introduce questions of unequal power dynamics and societal hegemony, with an emphasis on self-advocacy and collective action as vehicles for change (ideas central to the research questions shaping Phase One and Two of this project) with the goal of addressing two elements of best practice in multicultural education: 1) the need to teach explicitly about unequal power dynamics and develop curriculum that addresses issues of racism and discrimination, and 2) focus on social change that promotes equity for subordinated groups and facilitates the development of the skills and knowledge needed to become agents of change (Nelson, 2005). Consideration of the role of community builds on data collected and analyzed in the previous components of the study (see Chapters 4 and 5). The focus of data analysis in this chapter is on the effect of the process on the students' emerging understanding of unequal power dynamics and the role of collective action in fostering social change, the development of community among the class members, its importance to them, and its effect on their performance in the class, and the sense of power and agency students reported as a result of participating in the playmaking process and performing their piece.

This chapter includes a more detailed overview of the project design outlined in Chapter 3 (methodologies), analysis of the data relative to the research questions, a discussion of the outcomes of the playmaking process with particular focus on several unexpected moments in the development phase of the project which determined its final form, and my conclusions.

6.2 Project Design

The study was conducted with a Drama 2 class of 24 students at Chelsea High School. This group was selected because, though only three of the students had participated in a drama class before and only one had participated in productions, the positive energy, creativity, and thoughtfulness of the group suggested that they would have a wealth of ideas for the playmaking piece. The group was mixed by age (9 freshmen, 3 sophomores, 5 juniors, and 7 seniors, ranging in age from 14-20 years) and race/ethnicity (3 African American students, 18 Latino/a students from a variety of cultures, and 3 White students). Three of the students were recent immigrants and spoke very limited English, and a third of the students had Individualized Education Plans, indicating a range of learning issues for which specific accommodations must be made. When the project began, in March, 2009, there were 11 girls and 13 boys in the group. By the time they performed the finished piece, in May, 2009, two of the boys were no longer in the school.

The playmaking experience was initially designed to address the research questions guiding the study by uncovering and facilitating students' understandings of the ways in which their own experiences of discrimination are reflected in pervasive systemic inequities at the societal level (Apple, 1995, p.xv) and to facilitate the acquisition of skills that would allow them to become agents of social change (Freire, 1993). A second element involved exploring change agents from the past who, through collective action, provided a foundation of social change on which we, as a country, now stand. With a working title of "On the Shoulders of Giants," I started with the question, "If you could change one thing about the world that would make your life better, what would it be?" Six

students wrote about the need for equal access to money and jobs and eight wrote about the need to eliminate meanness and violence from their community and from society. As a group, we decided to pursue the connection between resources and meanness/violence as the focus of the piece.

Utilizing a variety of strategies, including improvisation, group and individual monologue creation, scene work, movement, games, and music, the students developed an original performance piece that incorporated music, text, image, and video to communicate the roles money and violence play in their lives. During this phase, the students explored a range of ideas, including family dynamics, school and peer interactions, social problems ranging from the drug trade to child abuse, joblessness, and the connection between wealth and power. The design of the process was formative; I developed exercises and prompts in response to the work they were creating, with the goal of moving their understandings forward and further exploring areas of the topic in which they demonstrated interest and knowledge about unequal power dynamics. I created the script from their words, scenes, and movement pieces, (adding only two lines to bridge some scenes together) and Amy, the drama teacher, directed the play for performance. The development process lasted 5 weeks, followed by 3 weeks of rehearsal and a performance for a mixed audience of Chelsea High School students and teachers, several parents and family members of participating students, white students from an upper middle class private school in the area, and undergraduate and graduate students from an area college. The composition of the audience was somewhat random. My concern was to ensure an audience of mixed races and a variety of socio-economic levels interested in what the students had to say.

6.2.1 Coding Categories

Data collected, coded, and analyzed include my daily field notes and post-class reflections, the daily field notes and reflections/comments of the ethnographer, notes on conversations/discussions with the classroom teacher, and the students' post-project interviews and group discussion. The direction of the students' original work moved away from the research questions which informed the design of the project, and the coding categories for the data reflect the direction dictated by the students' interests. I identified codes relative to the research questions guiding Phase Two and added codes suggested by the data.

The coding categories discussed in this analysis include:

Construction of the problem

Understanding of societal manifestations of inequity

Unequal power dynamics

Understanding of collective power

Community and power

Anti-community

6.2.2 Data Collection and Triangulation

I took notes while students were preparing scenes, movement pieces, etc., and I dedicated time after each class period to record my memory of events. This was particularly important for those classes in which I was teaching the bulk of the time. Amy also provided feedback and reflection in regular meetings. Additional triangulation was provided by Bevin, who was able to be present for 25 of the 30 sessions, and provided detailed ethnography. A review and vetting of preliminary findings was conducted with 19 of the 24 student participants, through a one-page itemization of my initial findings which they had the opportunity to

read and comment on individually, in writing. (for full text of initial findings, see Appendix H, p.378) In analyzing the data, I abandoned assumptions which were contested by more than one student in the member check.

6.2.3 Interviews

I conducted filmed post-project interviews with the 15 participants, including two of the graduated seniors who made themselves available. The interview questions invited the participants to reflect on their personal experiences of the project (What will stick in your mind from this experience? Why?), as well as exploring the learning objectives, (Name one thing you think you've learned from this experience. About the world? About power?) and their perspectives on collective action (Why do you think people protest/picket/do collective action?). The interviews were filmed by a student in the class who also filmed the monologues which students wrote, and which were used as projections in the show.

The interviews were transcribed in full and coded. The length of answers varied from student to student, but the interviews yielded a substantial body of data. The three students who spoke limited English also volunteered to be interviewed, however their facility with the language severely constrained their answers. Interestingly, though I offered to conduct the interviews in Spanish and have them translated, all three students refused. I don't know why.

Note: At the request of the students, I've used their real names in this paper.

6.3 Construction of the problem

What is the relationship between the personal and the social and the artistic in drama work? How can socially created artistic be used to develop a critically conscious and effective ensemble or collective (Neelands, 2006, p.18)?

The project began with a day of game-based activities designed to introduce me to the students and help them get used to my leadership of the group, allow me to get a sense of their function as individuals and as a class, and establish baseline ideas about their perspectives on themes/constructs that would be addressed during the project. A series of continua, in which students chose a place to stand on an invisible line between two extremes (e.g. I love ice cream/I hate ice cream), allowed me to assess their feelings about public speaking, their belief in the fairness/unfairness of the world, their responses to unfairness, their belief in the goodness (or not) of other people, and their sense of the world as subject to change (or not). At the end of the first class, I gave students a slip of paper on which was written the question: ‘If you could change one thing about the world that would make your life better, what would it be, and why?’ I had originally asked them each to recruit an answer to the question from an adult in their lives as well as answering it themselves, since I wanted the playmaking to reflect “adult” themes rather than “kid” themes. What I discovered in their answers was that many of them were already dealing with adult concerns. While there were a few ‘typical kid’ answers about best friend betrayal, six students wrote about the need for equal access to money and jobs:

- 6.1 Maria: "I would change the economy because people don't have money to pay or buy things they need in life like food, bills and mortgage."
- 6.2 Anthony: "I would change the economy because that means more of my family members having jobs."
- 6.3 Jorge: "I would make everything free. b/c no one would spend money"

and eight wrote about the need to eliminate meanness and violence from their community and from society:

- 6.4 Brian: "To get rid of haters and shit talkers..."
- 6.5 Jeremy: "Let there be no more hate because there would be understanding and no violence."
- 6.6 Gianni: "The way people act. Make the violent and mean people a little less like that."

As a group, we decided to pursue the connection between resources and meanness/violence as the focus of the piece, intuitively reflecting Fraser's (2003) assertion that "distributive questions must be central to *all* deliberations about institutionalizing justice" (p.87). In writing, scene work and discussion, students demonstrated their understanding of the problem they had identified. In the following excerpt, the role of money in the life of a teenager is explored:

- 6.7 Gianni: "I'm kind of bored."
- Jasmin: "What do you want to do?"

Gianni: “Go to the mall. I have to get money first.”

Jasmin: “Okay.”

Gianni: “Dad, can I have some money?”

Nick: “Here you go, take care.”

and in movement pieces created by the students early in the playmaking process, the importance of money, and the status associated with having money, were demonstrated directly, as the following excerpt indicates:

6.8 Gianni, Jasmin, and Suilmary are standing across the back of the stage. Jesus enters and gives money to each girl in turn, then sits on the stool. The girls circle around him, holding onto the edges of the dollar he gave each of them. They revolve around him.

In the following excerpt, students reflect on two sets of scenes they developed in which they explored the interaction of money and meanness; one in which there was substantial meanness/violence which generated very negative outcomes, and the second in which the changed behavior of one or more characters mitigated the scope of the problems.

6.9 T: “Which scenes were more realistic?”

All: “Both. The mean ones.”

T: “Okay, why?”

JR: “The first ones. Because people ARE mean, and they don’t care about anything except themselves.”

T: “Jeremy, you said meanness and the second set of scenes. Why?”

Jeremy: “Like, sometimes when you get fired from a job, people do try to help you. But sometimes people are mean.”

Michael: “People get greedy with their money. They want more and more and they do stupid, crazy things to get more.”

T: “Why else do money, meanness and violence go hand-in-hand so often?”

Julio: “People don’t care what they do to get money.”

JR: “It’s an everyday thing that you NEED.”

Julio: “Without it, you can’t do anything. You can’t go anywhere. You can’t help yourself, you can’t feed yourself.”

6.4 Inequity as a Societal Issue

Fraser’s (2003) construction of the folk paradigms of redistribution and recognition as covalent factors in maintaining hegemonic inequities at the societal level (p.12-13) were reflected in student scene work and interview, in which they demonstrated and discussed their awareness of the mutual imbrication of poverty, race and culture in the maldistribution of assets. When asked to create scenes about metaphorical ‘bad’ giants who try to crush ‘the little guy,’ connected to ideas of money and violence, students explored gangs, drug dealers, and child abuse. It was a powerful day of work; they demonstrated commitment to the task, and the images they produced were stark and effective, as the following excerpts from the gang and drug scenes demonstrate:

6.10 Gangs: Anthony, Jeremy, Michael, Maria, Brian

(Anthony, Jeremy and Brian were on big cubes. Michael and Maria on the floor.)

(Lemmy took a supplicant position next to them.)

Anthony, Jeremy, Brian: "I'm gonna' shoot you."

Michael: "Bang."

6.11 Drugs (on ladder): JR, Tatiana, Gianni, Jorge, Nick

(JR with hoodie over his face high on ladder, others on sides of ladder and floor)

(Brian and Jeremy at foot of ladder in dead and self-protective postures.)

JR: (offering drugs) "Take this."

All: "It'll make you feel better."

The drug dealer character, as a manifestation of social evil connected to money and violence, became a recurring character in scene work.

6.12 Lemmy: (*the mule*) "Do you have the money?"

Wendy and Maria: "No."

Anthony: (*The dealer, stretched out, smoking. Talking to Lemmy on phone.*) "Do they have the money?"

Lemmy: "No."

Anthony: "Then shoot them. Or I'll shoot you."

(*Lemmy picks up a gun and shoots them.*)

Interestingly, the students who created the gang ‘giant’ decided to abandon the topic. They told Amy that, due to escalating gang activity in the school, they were uncomfortable with what they had already shown and didn’t feel that they could explore the subject further.

The following is the third scene in a sequence about Latino men selling a ‘lemon’ (a broken down car) to an unsuspecting friend, which leads to the arrest of one of the men. Subsequently, Ruby, one of the scene’s creators, told me that this is the real story of how her father ended up in jail, turned in by his dishonest brother. She was very bitter about the unfairness of it.

6.13 *(Julio, Jasmin, and Ruby are sitting on the couch. Cops burst in, grab Julio, and throw him on the floor.)*

Ruby: “Get off him! What you doin’?!”

Jeremy: “He’s going to jail!”

Jasmin: “No, Daddy, don’t go!!”

(The cops drag Julio out.)

The next day, I asked them to do the scene with some mitigation of the meanness in it. Ruby said, “I’ll do it, but that’s not how it happened.”

The students’ ability to depict their lived experiences (with gangs, drugs, and the police) as local manifestations of a larger social problem was reflected in later discussion about the dynamics in play, as demonstrated in the following excerpt.

6.14 T: “Why is money a problem?”

Jasmin: “People are greedy.”

Brian: “Everybody wants it. People try to get it. If they can’t get it, it’s a problem and they have to find ways to get it.”

Lemmy: “If you don’t have money, you’re nobody and can’t go to places like restaurants, the simple things in life.”

Julio: “Money runs the world. If you don’t have it... nothing’s free.”

Ruby: “Money makes you. If you have money, you can move to the suburbs, be safe, send your kids to good schools. They can make something of themselves. If you don’t have money, you’re lucky to get those things.”

JR: “If money is the only thing you want, then you always want more.”

Bertolt Brecht states,

In 20 years of activist theatre I do not believe I have raised anyone’s consciousness, or liberated them, or brought them new understanding. I have, however, been changed with and through others, and they I hope, with and through me... in theatre, as in life, we develop one another (Brecht in McDonnell, 2005, P.73).

The students’ understanding of the societal nature of the problems they faced locally was often enhanced by the sharing of their stories with one another. This dynamic will be discussed more fully when considering community and power later in this paper, however the following exercise offers a stark example. We wanted to create a “mean machine” as an abstract movement element for the play. Ordinarily, this would involve one student starting a sound and movement in the center of the circle and other students joining one at a time until the entire group was engaged. The students in Drama 2 were too risk averse (too ‘cool’) for this activity, so I asked them to think of the meanest thing they’d ever heard said

to another person in their presence. We built a tower of cubes in the center of the stage, and students were instructed to place themselves on the cubes relative to the “meanness” of the comment they’d heard, those with less cruel comments taking positions on the lower levels and those with really offensive remarks claiming the peak of the tower. When they were in place, I conducted the chorus of meanness, pointing at students to indicate that they were to speak. At first the students giggled as they delivered their lines, but I encouraged them to say the words the way they’d heard them said. The comments they chose to share are listed in the following excerpt.

6.15 Michael: “Wow, what a dumpster slut!”

Jeremy: “You fuckin’ faggots!”

Anthony: “Fuckin’ faggot.”

Tatiana: “You are stupid!”

Jovanna: “You’re ugly!”

Jasmin: “You’re fat.”

Julio: “Cotton-picking nappy-headed nigger.”

Nick: “Die.”

Lemmy: “Go fuck yourself!”

Leyla: “You are so stupid.”

Jasmin: “You’re ugly!”

David: “Son of a slut.”

Siulmary: “Ho.”

Jorge: “Son of a whore.”

Jesus: “You gay, big-lipped faggot.”

April: "I hate you."

Maria: "Damn nigger, you suck."

J.R.: "Dumb fucking 'ho."

Brian: "You're a fuckin' skeeza."

Ruby: "You stupid fucking spic."

Wendy: "Stupid bitch."

The composite effect of these statements was striking and theatrically powerful, which the students recognized. However the experience sent the ethnographer, Bevin, who was usually a wry and humorous presence, from the room crying. The students seemed puzzled and concerned, and, when she returned, they asked her why she was upset. Bevin answered that it hurt her to know that they had heard those things said. There was a long silence afterwards and the students left class agitated. It signaled a change in their awareness of what they were showing, and the students who were going to perform the mean machine in performance seemed to feel uncomfortable saying the racist and cruel things they had written. They asked to wear money masks that were used in other scenes in the show (to denote a role in which money and meanness come together) so that they'd be anonymous.

During the post-project discussion, in response to the prompt: 'Name anything you noticed about the play, the day of the performance,' Brian commented on the effect of the mean machine.

- 6.16 Brian: “It really opened your eyes and see how you might have treated people because they’re a different race, so you think about how you talk to people.”

In interview, in response to the prompt: ‘Name one thing you learned from this experience’, students commented on their increased understanding of the societal scope of the problems they face.

- 6.17 Nick: “That a lot of people have harder lives than me. And mine isn’t so bad...Because the scenes were from people’s lives, and they were doing some brutal stuff.”
- 6.18 Wendy: “Just a lot of things happen in the world, that’s like really serious and everybody goes through a lot of things and it’s just not like only us. Everybody can relate to it... Because like...when I’m in a situation, I feel like I’m always the only one who experience this. And I’ve always been the only one that, um, has all the problems. Then I realized everyone in the world goes through a lot more things than I do.”
- 6.19 Katzia: “It’s pretty much runned by everything. Not jus’ one thing. Like everything ties in...like money is a big part or your color of your skin or whether or not you’re a boy or girl or your background. Everything ties in. And it runs your entire world.”

- 6.20 Brian: “Yeah it started out slow and came out with a lot of different purposes but I think the main purpose was that you can’t look at life through one person’s vision. You have to look at it with a lot of people’s vision. Different type of races. Different type of everything. You just gotta’ look at life with many opportunities and different point of views.”

6.5 Unequal Power Dynamics

I engage in dialogue because I recognize the social and not merely the individualistic character of the process of knowing. In this sense, dialogue presents itself as an indispensable component of the process of both learning and knowing (Freire, 1995, p.379).

Students’ dialogue, with each other and the teachers, fostered their understanding of the societal nature of the hegemonic dynamics and inequity they see and experience in their own lives.

- 6.21 Wendy: “Everyone wants the same equal rights. Everyone wants to be free. Everyone wants the same rights as everyone else.”

- 6.22 Ruby: “...it’s sad to say that in 2009 the world is not an equal place.”

Warnock (1978) states that there is always more in experience than we can predict. As students heard each other’s stories, they recognized repeating themes of discrimination and oppression, which were utilized in the creation of scenes

and monologues that highlighted the connection between money and unequal power dynamics, as is demonstrated in the following excerpt.

6.23 *(Nick is getting his shoes shined. JR and Jorge enter and sit down.)*

JR: “Ya, I made \$700,000 today.” *(to Gianni)* “Hey! Shine my friend’s shoes.”

(Gianni starts.)

JR: “Hey, you missed a spot. Do better. Clean the other one.”

(She finishes.)

JR: “Do you take plastic?”

Gianni: “No.”

JR: “Then you ain’t getting’ paid.”

Students were charged with creating inner monologues for both the rich man in the scene and the shoe shine girl. In order to address the varied literacy skills in the class and the writing challenges faced by some students, and in an effort to bring as many voices into the development of the script as possible, each student individually wrote two lines for the monologue, which were then sequenced by the group. In the following excerpt, the students discuss the perspective of the rich man in the scene:

6.24 Brian: “We basically put it as two categories. One is talking about money, and how he loves it, and the other is about how he’s hating the job that the worker is doing to his shoes.”

Katzia: “He’s snobby.”

Brian: “Yeah. Snobby, greedy mofo.”

The resulting monologue demonstrates the connection between wealth and meanness perceived by the students.

6.25 Rich Man: “I love money. Man, I’m so rich. I just love money. I’m cool. She’d better hurry up. She’s horrible! Hurry up, I got things to waste money on! I shouldn’t even have to pay for this cheap ass work! I hate this work. She better not even ask for a tip because she ain’t gettin’ one.”

The monologue created for the shoe shine girl reflects the students’ understanding of her financial position and her relative powerlessness in the face of the rich man’s abuse.

6.26 Shoe shine Girl: “I hate this job, these guys are so messed up. [*SIGH*.] Do I look like a slave? [*SIGH*] I’m too tired to work. [*SIGH*] I need another job. [*SIGH*] But, I need money for food. So I gotta’ keep this job, but, [*SIGH*] I HATE this job.”

In performance, the mean/violent and wealthy characters often wore half-masks covered with hundred dollar bills to depict the connection between violence and money. Students further demonstrated their evolving understanding of these dynamics in commenting on the meaning of this aesthetic choice.

6.27 Jeremy: “The cash masks showed how evil the world was.”

- 6.28 Michael: “The cash masks kind of make sense because sometimes people get blinded by money.”

In interview, students discussed the societal nature of problems that they had assumed were unique to them. Through the playmaking process and developing a shared narrative, they began to understand unequal power dynamics and the effects on their lives.

- 6.29 David: “Money can really rule people’s lives and it can help their lives. That’s what I learned. I didn’t think money was that important but I just found out it is...I didn’t know that this could happen with money. I didn’t want to know that money can corrupt people’s minds. It’s horrible to see what people can do with money. How they think they are.”

- 6.30 Brian: “Power...basically the more power you have the more you have...I don’t want to say the right...but in your mind...you have the right to do whatever you want... But then this causes problems...like your mind can get corrupted and all that stuff. Like, you might think you can do whatever you want.”

- 6.31 Wendy: “It’s good to have power, but if you have too much...it will like definitely corrupt your mind. You’ll start abusing it and...go against everything else you know. Take over everything.”

Towards the end of the development process, I introduced images of people of color in recent moments of collective action, all of which had succeeded to some degree. The photos showed immigrants assertively demonstrating for amnesty, a work action by airport employees in which each protestor wore a sign reading “I am a Human Being,” and a family participating in the National Day of Immigration protest. Each student went to the picture to which they felt most drawn and recreated the photos with their bodies. I asked them to speak the thoughts that the people in the image might have been thinking.

6.32 Anthony: “Power, Freedom, Liberty, Rights, Pride.”

Jesus: “Justice! Viva Mexico!”

Wendy: “Liberal rights.”

Lemmy: “Equality.”

Katzia: “I have the right to be heard.”

Brian: “Freedom of speech.”

The emotional connection the students felt to these protesters was palpable, and even the most reluctant actors in the group were fully engaged, physically and emotionally. After a few days in which the development of material had been a struggle, the students seemed invested again. The images of the protests were powerful for them, and they took them very seriously. Students identified the fact that the protesters were risking it all and spoke their fears, including being unemployed, arrested, deported, killed, and their plan failing.

I agreed that many of the immigrants in the photos were likely undocumented and were taking a substantial risk to appear in a public protest. I asked the students to name what might make them take that risk:

6.33 Lemmy: “To stand up for their country.”

Brian: “They want equal rights to everybody else.”

Julio: “You’re making a point. If you’re taking a risk, other people might come and join. You can only go so far with a small group of people.”

Lemmy: “If they don’t do it, who else will? If that person says I want to stand up for my country, everyone around them can do it. It’s a matter of support, that’s all that matters.”

I asked the students to name something they would take a risk to stand up for, and the results were an interesting mix of the political:

6.34 Wendy: “Gay rights.”

Ruby: “Being able to live in your country without feeling like an alien almost.”

Brian: “Unjust governmental power.”

Michael: “Equal rights.”

Maria: “Against deportation.”

Anthony: “Job rights.”

Nick: “Hunger.”

Jesus: “Equality.”

and the personal:

6.35 Lemmy: “Family.”

Siulmary: “Hunger and children.”

Jovanna: “Children.”

Leyla: “Family.”

Gallagher (2007) emphasizes the importance of the “space” created in the drama classroom to allow the safe exploration of conflict, and to explicitly address issues of unequal power dynamics, as does Fine (2003), in her study of high school de-tracking in Montclair, New Jersey, in which teachers explicitly attempted to facilitate students’ ability to consider the ‘view from the bottom’ and to explore through discussion the unequal power dynamics prevalent in society. Student response evolved across the year, moving from rejection of the disempowered “other” to a more informed consideration of the complex dynamics which create ‘victims’ and resultant empathy. A similar transition occurred through the playmaking process, as the following excerpt indicates.

6.36 Jeremy: “...something that I learned? Is gonna have to be...that you shouldn’t judge nobody from the way they look. Just because they’re immigrants or anything else...That’s the one thing I learned. Don’t judge somebody for the way they look like, judge somebody how you know them, how they act. Don’t get me wrong, I used to be a jerk. Ya’ know, to people who always come here, immigrated. Like, I made fun of them. I wouldn’t, like, hurt them, but I made fun of them as a joke. But I realized,

like, their struggle, what they're going through. They're trying to get, ya' know, what they're going through to show that they're really people. Like try to get independence, ya' know...I see the struggles and I'm like, man, I'm just like one of those other people that's contributing. I'm like the mean machine. Like, and I learned that I shouldn't be that way."

6.6 Understanding of Collective Power

Many of the students, as demonstrated in the continua that began our work together, started from a position of skepticism regarding the possibility of change in the world.

6.37 Tatiana: "People don't want to change the economy."

6.38 Brian: "I believe that life and society can change, but that there's always going to be certain people who are negative to anything, like racism, there's always going to be a dilemma between certain people. There will be some change but not everything."

Much of the early development of material emphasized collective effort, (including warm-up games such as Amoeba Tag, in which one student is "it" and adds others to the "it" by tagging them, until the whole group is part of "it"), and asked students to explore the ways in which people come together to try to make change, even in the face of 'giant' societal forces. The following is a post- scene discussion of these dynamics:

6.39 Amy: “What makes people respond to giants?”

Brian: “They’re tired of being bullied.”

Michael: “Courage.”

Julio: “’Cause they pass the limit and they go too far and maybe they went and hurt one of your family members, maybe they offended a part of you they shouldn’t have. You know?”

Amy: “What makes a little guy stand up to a giant?”

Katzia: “Sympathy.”

Lemmy: “Respect. Cause when someone is putting you down, you stand up, you get your self-respect back.”

Brian: “Dignity. When someone has power over you, you lose your dignity. Then you have to stand up to them and you get your own dignity back.”

Amy: “What do you think the outcome is if the little guy stands up to the big giant?”

Michael: “The little guy wins...Don’t you read fairy tales?”

Siulmary: “You might end up in the hospital.”

Julio: “When you have so much courage in you that someone crosses you, I believe someone can stand up.”

Katzia: “The little person can always take down the giant.”

In a repeat of the continua from the first class period on whether changing the world is possible, which I conducted during the post-performance wrap-up, there was a significant shift, with most of the group clumped together on the side of ‘change is possible,’ and only two students representing the opposing point of

view. While this is not proof of their changed attitudes, it is an indicator of their community orientation, and their (even transitory) belief that change is possible. In interview, the connection between change and collective action was clearly identified by many students in response to the question: ‘Why do you think people protest/picket/ do collective action?’

6.40 Siulmary: “Because they want their voice to be heard. You don’t want--- they want to make a change, they don’t want to leave things the way they are... I’ve learned that when you work together you can accomplish something... Like, if everybody comes together, they can do a lot, make a change.”

6.41 Wendy: “I think they do that so that their voice can be heard. And so they can try to make a difference in the world. They’re trying to make their life better...Because there’s probably a lot of other people in the world that wants the same thing but they’re too afraid to and they want the same thing but they’re afraid that no one else will hear them out.”

6.42 Katzia: “Um, divided we fall, together we stand. I mean really it, like, may be corny, it may be a corny saying, but honestly, the more people you have working with you the better you may get your point across. I mean, it takes an army to actually be heard.”

6.43 Brian: “To speak their minds. Honestly...they want their point of view out there. They want the right for what they’re fighting for. I mean...in this

experience you have to, you have to work together. You start off small and sooner or later people will hear you out and be like, I have the same problem as you...so let me fight for the same reason.”

Students also talked about the fact that ordinary people, who looked like them and their family members, came together to make change, and that made it seem more possible for them.

6.44 Katzia: “Change is possible... You can make a difference. Whether you alone or stand with the support of others your voice will be heard. So... Stand up, take a chance, and change shall come to pass. All you need is that one person to take charge and I guarantee others will follow. Be an example!”

6.45 Nick: “...people can...flip the sides. Take control. ...By standing up and...yeah....By not letting the person who has the power...take control of them.”

6.46 Katzia: “Because they feel like they have a right to voice their opinion. And they’re right, they do. No matter, like, who you are. You have the right to say what you want to say no matter what it may be.”

6.7 Voice

The realization of most societal goals, even in situations in which the actor's commitment and knowledge are considerable, requires the application of power (Etzioni, 1968, p.314).

6.47 Katzia: "Oh please. I'm just gonna' open my mouth and say what I gotta' say. That's all it takes. I mean, as I said in the play, I have a right to be who I am."

People need to feel powerful in order to act (Galinsky, Gruenfeld, and Magee, 2003). According to Prilleltensky, Nelson and Peirson (2001), the goal is to create communities in which individuals have enough power to satisfy their needs and work in concert with others to advance collective goals. Research points to community as a source of power for urban students, and to applied drama as a tool for generating such communities (Nelson, 2009). The community-rich environment of the drama class (Gallagher, 2007; Cahill, 2002; Nelson, Colby & McIlrath, 2001; Wagner, 1998; Manley and O'Neill, 1997; Neelands, 1990) is well-positioned to facilitate the development of a sense of voice and power in students (Neelands, 2007; Gallagher, 2007; Nelson, 2005). The following section discusses the role of voice in the Drama 2 class and considers the possible effects of the playmaking experience on student voice.

The question of voice, and the freedom to speak your mind publicly, sharply divided the group when the project began, from Katzia, on the extreme "love to speak in public" end of the line, to Ruby and David, at the other extreme.

The following excerpts, in which Katzia and Ruby clarify their positions, demonstrate:

6.48 Katzia: “It gives me a chance to express myself so that others can hear me.”

6.49 Ruby: “Hate it. Always. Hate it.”

The question of students’ belief in the effectiveness of using their voices for change was similarly polarizing. In response to the prompt: unfairness makes me angry/ I just shrug when something’s unfair, Anthony’s position was absolute:

6.50 Anthony: “When something’s not right, I have to say something.”

while Gianni and Siulmary took more moderate positions:

6.51 Gianni: “Sometimes it matters, but sometimes you can’t really change it.”

6.52 Siulmary: “It depends on the situation whether or not you’ll say something.”

and David stood at the “shrugging” extreme:

6.53 David: (shrugs) “That’s life.”

There were other indicators of students' reluctance to use their voices early in the development process. I had charged the students with asking an adult in their lives the question they'd answered: 'If you could change one thing in the world that would make your life better, what would it be?' While 20 of the 24 students returned the slip of paper with their own answer to the question on it, only 7 students had asked an adult the question as well. The following excerpt of a brief conversation I had with Brian was clarifying in this regard:

6.54 Brian calls me over to where he and Jeremy are sitting in the auditorium.

Brian: "Miss? Bethany?"

(He shows me the green paper I handed out the day before.)

Brian: "I don't have any adult I talk to that way. I don't talk to adults like that."

Me: "Any adult?"

Brian: "Nope."

Me: "Is there a teacher...?"

Brian: "No. No one."

(I suggest that he talks with one of the Security Guards. They are mostly gigantic guys, very tough, but not mean to the kids. It feels like they're on their side in some way.)

Brian: "I'll ask Steve."

Jeremy nods: "Ya. Steve. That's good."

In the post-project interview with Brian, I asked him about this interaction:

6.55 Bethany: "...I'm curious if you feel like that's changed for you at all? If you would ask someone now."

Brian: "Oh definitely. I would ask someone now...[B]efore the whole experience I was like ...what? What is this? Like, why do we have to do this? But after doing the whole show and putting our mind and emotions out there...and then after the show how everybody was like, oh man, I can't believe! Ya know, this show was so... and you hear what other people have to say, you just want to know more. So you would ask other people..."

Students' perspectives on voice, the possibility of using it and the possibility of being heard by others, seemed to change as a result of the playmaking experience. By the end of the process, even Ruby and David, the two who were most resolute in their resistance to speaking publicly, had shifted.

6.56 David: "I like to now. I hang out with different people now."

6.57 Ruby: "I don't mind it so much anymore."

The following discussion considers the aspects of the playmaking experience that seemed to move students toward a reconsideration of voice and the possibility of agency in school.

6.7.1 Applied Theatre/Drama and Voice

Bourdieu (1993) contends that "the dominated are the least capable of controlling their own representation" (p.50) and "they are spoken of more than

they speak” (p.51). Applied Theatre and Drama (AT/D), defined by Nicholson (2005) as “dramatic activity that primarily exist outside conventional mainstream theatre institutions, and which are specifically intended to benefit individuals, communities and societies” (p.2) and characterized as “the relationship between theatre practice, social efficacy, and community building” (p.2), seeks to rectify that dynamic. In AT/D, processes of working are embodied and involved, and are intimately connected to the social and cultural contexts in which they take place. They “often bring(s) into focus questions of allegiance, identity, and belonging” (p.13) and invite “questions about the contribution we are each making to the process of social change” (Nicholson, 2005, p.23). The playmaking experience of Phase Two reflects this definition, in both intent and practice.

There were two events during the development of the piece that point to the role power and agency played in students’ learning through the playmaking process, and the connection of identity and culture to that power. The first was a seemingly simple thing- I asked the students to suggest music they liked for use in the show. Student response was immediate and enthusiastic as they called out songs and artists: “Styles P!” “Vico C!” “Seether!” and so on. Students advised me on how I might access their various suggestions online, and brought me CDs with hard-to-locate Latino artists on them. I used as many of their songs as I could reasonably fit into the show, and they were delighted. This early indication that they had real power to make decisions and that their cultural choices would be reflected in the finished play increased their commitment and risk-taking during the development process. In interview, JR identified the music as his favorite element of the show. When asked why, he beamed and said, “You guys played my song!”

The second event occurred when I introduced what I had assumed (incorrectly) would be the unifying theme of the play—the idea that we stand on the shoulders of the ‘giants’ who came before us, who sacrificed to help society move forward in addressing race-based inequities, primarily through collective action. This idea fell flat, as even the most engaged participants looked uneasy and avoided eye contact. When asked to name these ‘giants’, unenthusiastic mumblings of “MLK,” “Rosa Parks,” and “César Chávez” were offered. I asked them to consider whose shoulders they stand on in their own lives. This was met with an apologetic but resolute silence. Finally, I pressured them into answering. They reluctantly went around the circle, naming family members and friends. Only Brian stayed silent. Later, I overheard him tell Amy, apparently to explain his lack of cooperation, “I don’t stand on anyone’s shoulders. I made myself.”

The next day, I addressed Brian’s perspective with the class (with his permission) and asked each student to write a monologue about a time s/he took control of her/his own life. Many of the monologues addressed deeply personal challenges that the students had faced and overcome, including having parents in jail, sexual assault, loss of family, moving from their country of origin, and dealing with gender dynamics.

6.58 Brian: “When I was 12, my father had left for the Dominican Republic for vacation which he usually does, but this vacation was different. A month passed by but he still hadn’t arrived. I asked my Mom where he was and she told me, “On vacation in D.R.” She repeated that for months, but during those months, I noticed things changing. It was harder to get food,

clothes. I didn't have any support. My mother hardly cared because she fed off her boyfriend, so, as the days passed, I decided what I wanted to do. I took control of my whole life. On my birthday, when I turned 13, my father returned. I soon figured out my Mom was lying to me this whole time. My father was in jail in DR for attempted murder."

6.59 Katzia: "As a matter of fact, your honor, I do have something to say to the defendant. I just wanted to say thank you for making me stronger. What you did was wrong, but I'm opening my mouth and letting my voice be heard so that others won't become victims of sexual assault or rape. I'm here today to stand up for my rights to take charge, open my mouth, and say, "No, I refuse to remain silent anymore and let this eat me up inside or affect others that I know who may have gone through the same. Because I know there are others out there, but I will definitely set the trend and lead the way. Thank you!"

6.60 Siulmary: "Not so long ago, my father came to visit me from Puerto Rico. All my life, I've lived with my Mom while he was in PR. When he came, he wanted to take me with him. In a way, I wanted to go. He talked to my Mom and wanted to take me even if she said no. When I thought into it, I realized he was never able to provide for me, but my mother was always there. I told him I wasn't gonna' go even though it hurt him a little. He understood and got over it."

6.61 David: “One day, it was the end of 8th grade and from that day I never hanged with my friends nor did I ever stay after school. This day I just felt like hanging with friends. It was 10 am and I hanged until 3 pm. I came home and my family is in the house calling, and I see my Mom crying. It turns out they were looking for me; they thought I got lost or kidnapped. I told them I just wanted to hang and she would never let me. So she tells me, “You’re getting older and this is your life now.” And that day, I took over my life.”

Sharing these had a profound effect on the class. Richard Sennett (1998), in commenting on the transitory nature of current times, states that “no one becomes a long-term witness to another person’s life” (pp.42-3). By coming together in this playmaking experience, students became witness to each other’s lives, if only for a time, and they recognized the significance of that shared understanding.

6.62 Wendy: “...just a lot of things happen in the world, that’s like really serious and everybody goes through a lot of things and it’s just not like only us. Everybody can relate to it.”

6.63 Gianni: “Because the play like, like it made everybody tell the truth about themselves...Because you see like what people really are and not their image.”

6.64 Brian: “It takes a lot for someone to control their own life... And to hear other peoples’ experience about how they made themselves or how they are now is kinda’ crazy, because you compare how you made yourself and you compare how they made themselves and you kinda’ realize that there are similarities between a person even though you might not think there is.”

When asked to name the feeling of taking control of their own lives, students answered that they felt powerful, confident, happy, proud, dignified, nervous, in charge, respected, responsible and amazing. As a result of this component of the development process, students seemed to experience greater trust and a sense of community (McMillan and Chavis, 1986) with one another, and an increased sense of their control over the content of the play.

Jeffrey Weeks (2000) claims that “when the old stories of group (communal) belonging no longer ring true, demand grows for the ‘identity stories’ in which ‘we tell ourselves about where we came from, what we are now and where we are going; such stories are urgently needed to restore security, build trust and make ‘meaningful interaction with others’ possible” (in Bauman, 2001, p. 98-9). In the process of developing the piece, students shared deeply personal stories of struggle and overcoming with each other, and in interview identified that sharing as central to the establishment of community bonds, and to their developing understanding of unequal power dynamics in the world.

6.65 Brian: “I think it was everyone’s personality all together like everybody like they notice they could come out and be themselves so they’re like

okay, come out of the shell, and we just had a whole bug out and different people have different personality. Like myself, always the clown, always make people laugh. And so you know they were really comfortable and... and idea's came along."

In the post-project interviews, students regularly mentioned voice as their favorite part of the experience:

6.66 Ruby: "I liked the improv stuff. Like, we wrote our lines, and it was all the truth and we didn't have to like, sugar-coat anything."

6.67 Brian: "I like the beginning. Not the beginning of the show, but the making of the show...(thoughtful pause.) Cause your natural person comes out. You be who you want to be."

6.68 Jasmin: "...I felt more free to speak my mind."

Through sharing their stories, students came to see the power they held individually. Their bonding as a community made this a shared power as they began to realize their collective strength.

6.69 Siulmary: "... the self---can be very powerful...by having a say in things, and standing up for yourself."

6.8 Community

Over the course of the development and rehearsal process, the students in the Drama 2 class developed a powerful sense of community. Though they didn't all know each other's names at the start of the project, Amy had worked for several weeks to establish a culture of community in the room. She used collaborative theatre games and activities, and established rules for the classroom that discouraged unkindness, name-calling, and 'capping' of any kind, while positively reinforcing cooperation, thoughtfulness and sharing between students.

The foundation of collaborative, caretaking attitudes within the group was apparent in warm-up games, in which students held hands freely with both males and females and exhibited casual touch in a variety of games. The students strongly preferred competitive games, but their cooperative ethic was demonstrated even in competitive moments. For example, Brian often won at games, and it was very important to him to do so, and he was most often able to do so. This might have fostered resentment among the other high status males in the class, but it didn't. In a highly competitive version of creature/house/flood, I added a component that asked the students to choose between themselves (their goal was not to be a creature, if at all possible) and the good of their peers. They consistently chose in the interest of their peers rather than themselves, reflecting the Communal Power Orientation described by Chen, Lee-Chai, and Bargh (2001). This was somewhat surprising as, in the earlier version of the game, they had been making secret pacts with each other to pair up so they wouldn't be "out" for a turn. The awareness of the needs of the group over the needs of the individual was discussed after a game of Extreme Rock/Paper/Scissors, in which

two teams choose a gesture as a group, and the winning side races to tag the fleeing members of the losing side.

6.70 Amy: “How is Extreme Rock/Paper/Scissors different from regular?”

Julio: “You’re not just picking for yourself, you’re picking for an entire group. When you’re wrong, your whole group is suffering for your mistake.”

Students demonstrated a strong sense of community in their group dynamics and planning for scene work. As in the two previous components of the project, there was virtually no inter-group conflict while planning scenes.

Students demonstrated interest in the ideas and points of views of their classmates, and offered help when one of their peers seemed to be struggling, as the following excerpt demonstrates:

6.71 Lemmy: “So, I have a bunch of ideas in my head, but I’m not sure how to get them out of my head!”

Ruby: “So, the girls can’t count on me. So then what?”

Lemmy: “Who else would be there instead? What about some older relative that doesn’t know what they’re doing?”

Students demonstrated sensitivity to the deeply personal nature of the stories that were shared. For example, when Katzia was unwilling to perform her own monologue about confronting her rapist in court, but very much wanted it to be included in the script, Maria immediately offered to do it, in spite of her own

shyness and reluctance to perform. The following excerpt describes an interaction I had with Brian, who was performing the role of the cop in the scene based on the arrest of Ruby's father.

6.72 When Brian, as the cop, was rehearsing the scene for the show, he was doing comic stuff, wearing his hat on sideways and such. I told him, "I need you to do this straight. This is Ruby's real story, so it's important..." He interrupted me. He said, "I'm just messing around for rehearsal. I'll do it right for the show." He did it straight for the rest of the time.

Further, the content of scenes reflected a strong community orientation. When I asked students to consider who the 'giants' are in their lives, they struggled to answer, which was unusual with this verbal, forthcoming group. It was a difficult interaction:

6.73 T: "Who are positive giants that have really carried people? Name someone specifically in your life."

Brian: "Myself."

Michael: "My mother."

(Jorge gives daps.)

T: "Why?"

Michael: "Because she takes care of me. Without her, I wouldn't be here."

Lemmy: "I agree with Michael."

(Very quiet. Long pauses.)

T: "Okay, talk to the person next to you. I want you to come up with two people in your life whose shoulders you stand on. Talk with each other and you're going to report back what they said."

(Much more chatter now.)

David: "Wendy stands on the shoulders of her sister."

Anthony: "The police, they protect us."

Jasmin: "Grandparents and aunts, they help you no matter where you are."

Gianni: "When they come and visit they give the most they can."

Siulmary: "Anyone that's older than me. Because they have more experience in life."

Katzia and April: "Our grandmothers."

April: "My grandmother never misses any of her grandchildren's birthdays."

JR: "Someone who gives me support and gives you a weight to live on, providing help. My mommadukes. Yeah, and friends."

Lemmy: "My best friend because even though she's far away from me, I always know that she's there for me, and we talk about the future. And I love her so much, and I miss her."

While they struggled with the discussion, they were easily able to communicate their ideas in action in the scenes created subsequently. In the following scenes, students depict family members and friends who are 'giants' on whose shoulders they stand:

6.74 Julio: “Bro you see that over there? That’s what I want you to do. I want you to finish school. I WANT YOU to become something in the future. I don’t want you doin’ that stuff” (*indicating two girls drinking.*) “Don’t fall. I dropped out of school.”

Katzia: (*Drunk, staggering over with alcohol.*) “You want some of this?”

Julio: “Get away from here! What’re you doing?!”

Katzia: “What you mean ‘what I’m doing!’?”

Julio: “Are you crazy?”

Katzia: “No, I’m just drunk.”

Julio: (*to David*) “Bro, don’t fall.”

David: (*to audience*) “I stand on the shoulders of my brother because he led me to the right path.”

6.75 (*Brian and Jesus are in a car. Brian is driving.*)

Brian: “What’s wrong with this car? It broke down on us!”

Jesus: “What the hell we gonna’ do now?”

Brian: “Yo, ma!? Yo, ma? No, the car broke down. It’s like five o’clock in the morning, can you come pick us up? Ma! (*Click*) (*To Jesus*) She’s too busy getting drunk!”

Jesus: “Why don’t you call Jeremy?”

Brian: (*calling Jeremy, waking him up*) “Yo, we’re broke down. Can you come pick us up? Are you sleeping?”

Jeremy: “No no, man, I’m not sleeping.”

(*Jeremy drives over and picks them up and then takes them out for food.*)

Brian: *(to audience)* “I stand on the shoulders of my friend Bito because he is there when no one else is.”

6.76 *(Wendy and Siulmary are facing each other playing patty cake.)*

Lemmy: “Are you guys okay? Mom’s gonna’ be here soon okay.”

Ruby: “Hi guys. Are you okay, are you good?”

Wendy and Siulmary: “Hi mom!!!!”

Ruby: *(to Lemmy)* “How much do I owe you?”

Lemmy: “A hundred dollars.”

Ruby: “I don’t have it. I only have 95.”

Lemmy: “You can just give it to me next week.”

Ruby: “Okay.”

Lemmy: “That’s okay! *(takes money)* *(Exits)* Be good, girls!”

Ruby: “You guys hungry?”

Wendy and Siulmary: “Yeah, we’re really hungry.”

(Ruby gives them food and then gives them hers when they’re still hungry.)

Wendy and Siulmary: *(to audience)* “I stand on the shoulders of my mother because she raised me by herself, and she was able to sacrifice anything for me.”

One poignant example of the community students experience as residents of Chelsea occurred when a 15-year-old boy named José died on the commuter rail tracks in Everett after having been hit by a train. He was ‘tagging’ (painting graffiti) and his friend said the cops were coming. He turned to run and ran into an oncoming train on the tracks. He was killed instantly. The mood of the school

was somber and subdued for several days, and the tone of the cafeteria was noticeably quieter, with less laughing and less talking. The class was also subdued. Some students were nonchalant (Brian, Jeremy), others were noticeably upset (April, Katzia), but they were all talking about it, and not as an exciting, dramatic event. At lunch, the school administration held a collection for the family of the student to help pay for the funeral. After first lunch, they had already collected more than \$1000. According to Amy, students, many of whom work to contribute to the family's rent, were putting \$20 bills into the box, saying, "My parents sent this for them."

6.8.1 Community with Amy

The students also demonstrated a strong sense of community with Amy. Though they accepted my leadership during the development of the playmaking piece, they often turned to Amy for advice with scenes or clarification when they were confused. On the days that Amy led the development, students were happy to have her back, and there seemed to be security for them in having her familiar voice, tone and pace leading the class. She clearly cares about the students and is skilled at fostering their belief in themselves, as is demonstrated in the following excerpt of their interaction at the beginning of the rehearsal process:

6.77 Amy: "You're going to feel overwhelmed, but the more we do it, the more comfortable you're going to feel."

She frequently reiterates her faith in their abilities and simultaneously holds them to a high standard of achievement, behavior, and participation.

6.78 Brian: “And then we bow?”

Amy: “Yes, but we’re not practicing that today. I don’t practice bows until you deserve to bow.”

All: “Ooooooh.”

Brian: “I think we should do the whole thing from the beginning to the end now.”

Amy: “An excellent idea.”

In spite of the students’ inexperience with rehearsal and performance, Amy was able to break the task down into manageable chunks, and to engage them in the problem-solving process when things weren’t working well.

6.79 Amy: “What are your thoughts about how this went?”

Michael: “It was awesome.”

Amy: “It was awesome?”

Brian: “It could’ve been better.”

Amy: “How? How could it have been better?”

Jeremy: “Too slow. It needs to speed up.”

Amy: “Why? Why is it slow?”

Ruby: “People are being lazy and taking their time.”

Wendy: “Not knowing when to come on.”

Amy: “How can we fix this? What can you do, what can we do, what can I do to make it better?”

The students responded well to her invitation to brainstorm solutions, and felt free to challenge her ideas when they disagreed with her, as the following excerpt, in which she makes a suggestion regarding the blocking of a cheer they created, demonstrates.

6.80 Amy: “Make the letters, like YMCA. That’s cute.”

Jesus: “Cute?!”

Amy: “Okay, if you don’t like it, come up with something else.”

Anthony: “How about step. Like stomp.”

Amy: “Okay, I like that! Just improv it right now and we’ll come up with something later.”

During the rehearsal process, however, they often seemed surprised by her dissatisfaction with their performance and behavior, a dynamic I’ll discuss further in a later section of the chapter.

6.8.2 My Role in the Community

Over the course of the 8 week project, the students also invited me into their community. This was a gradual process, made challenging by my age, my race, my somewhat mysterious status as a researcher, and my preference for working barefoot, which caused JR to refer to me as “Twinkle Toes.” Michael reflected the feelings of a number of the students when he told Bevin, “I don’t understand her.” J.R. added, “She scares me a little.”

There were several moments during the project which moved the students toward me, and me toward them. The first was my response to their music suggestions. They were obviously and vocally surprised and pleased that I had

accessed their songs during the 24-hour break between classes, and began initiating conversation with me about music for the show.

The second moment happened during a warm-up exercise, in which I introduced the students to the heretofore unknown game, the Three-Legged Race. Only a few students had ever heard of it before, and none of them had played it. The students hobbled around in pairs, with their legs tied together, trying to get the hang of it before the races began. From the beginning, Brian and Jeremy were a nearly unbeatable team; in fact, I handicapped them a few times to give other teams a chance at winning. The best moment was in the final race, when David and Julio were a team. They really wanted to win, and as they turned to do the second leg of the race, they realized that Brian and Jeremy didn't know that they had to run a second lap. Inspired, they sprinted forward. Unfortunately, Julio lost his balance and fell on his behind, but David didn't pause; he just kept running. It was like watching the incredible hulk—he pounded forward, dragging 165 pound Julio by the leg. They came in second, but the whole group, including me, exploded in laughter. We had a rare experience—a shared belly laugh. It lasted for several minutes and kept re-erupting. Amy later observed that it was like a moment of childhood for them. Their childhoods are short, and it was beautiful to see them participate in the three legged race and laugh with complete abandon.

Third, once I delivered the finished script to them, the class became increasingly inclusive of me. They were withdrawing toward the end of the process, tired of creating scenes, but they loved the script and commented frequently on the fact that it was their words. They began initiating conversation more often, called me Bethany rather than 'Miss' (something I'd asked them to do but which was quite difficult for them), and told me little things about their lives.

I also built props on the edge of the stage with April and Richard, and the students came by to check them out and ask questions. The cash masks were a particular favorite. When the first one was close to completion, Michael came by and pronounced it “gangsta” and Ruby called it “killa.”

6.9 Community and Power

The SOC and power experienced by the students was reflected in their improved function as students in the Drama 2 class. Though the students experienced a range of challenges, from limited exposure to theatre forms, to limited facility with English, to substantial learning issues reflected in limited literacy, their performance in the playmaking project, both the development of original material and the rehearsal and performance of the finished script, demonstrated commitment, effort and growth across the period of the project.

In spite of varied levels of theatre knowledge across the group, the students quickly came to recognize who had good scene outcomes and lots of ideas, and turned to these students for vetting of scene planning. These students: Ruby, Jeremy, Brian, Julio, Lemmy and Katzia, were of a range of ages and status levels in the group, and were not among the more experienced drama students. As the students became more familiar with the playmaking structures, they quickly developed an understanding of what ‘worked’ and what didn’t, and made self-reflective comments about their scene’s quality that were often accurate.

By the time we began rehearsing, the students demonstrated enthusiasm for performing that was largely absent at the beginning of the project. Aware that, as Denzin (1997) states, “every time a text is performed, a performance ethic is enacted” (p.120), and in response to the importance of not ‘speaking about’ but

“to and with others, keeping [the work] open-ended; critiquing, interrupting, and empowering” (p.121), before casting the roles in the show, I polled the students. I asked each student to indicate whether s/he would prefer a large or small role, whether they were comfortable with my use of their personal monologue in the finished script, and whether s/he would prefer to perform her/his monologue. During rehearsal, students who had asked for small roles volunteered for larger parts, as first Julio, then Lemmy, left the school. In reflecting on this change, one student stated:

6.81 T: “Many people went from wanting small roles to wanting bigger roles.

Why do you think that is?”

Siulmary: “They got comfortable. I don’t know why. They knew that they could do it, they knew that people weren’t laughing at them.”

In one instance, when two of the members of the ‘mean machine’ were having trouble with the sequence of lines, other students readily volunteered to step in.

6.82 Brian: “Oh man, I’d love to do it.”

Jeremy: “Yeah! I’d do it.”

Michael: “The fact that we have to know the same lines each time, it’s messing up my game.”

Bevin: “Then step up your game.”

All: “OOOOoooh.”

Bevin: “Seriously. Miss C, can I say something?”

Amy: “Yes. Go ahead.”

Bevin: “Do you guys remember the day you first created this work? You remember how I left because I cried?”

Mean Machine: “Yeah...”

Bevin: “Try and remember what it was like to be connected to that. Because I believed you guys, and that was weeks ago, so I know you can do it.”

Jeremy: “Oh, that just touched my heart for real.”

Amy: “And that’s why I’m getting frustrated. I know you can make this happen.”

This indicates the importance of the trusting community established in the class, between students and with the adults, as a factor in student effort and achievement. Another indicator of the effect of community on student outcomes is that every student was present for the performance. This is not typical at Chelsea for a class-based project, according to Amy. Given that students are assigned to the class to fulfill a fine arts requirement, and that the seniors had already graduated by the time the show went on, we had created contingency plans to fill roles should there be absenteeism. We had one near miss, but everyone came, and several students invited family members to attend the performance which took place during the school day- often a challenge for working parents- and they attended.

Students repeatedly commented on the importance of community to the outcome of the project, as is demonstrated in the following excerpt. In response to the question: What were you proudest of the group for? students responded:

6.83 JR: “We worked together.”

Jeremy: “Everybody working together. Actually sticking to it and not being like, ‘I’m done with this.’”

Katzia: “We were supportive of each other, giving encouragement.”

Anthony: “When people didn’t make fun of each other.”

Katzia: “It came together.”

JR: “Oh, for real, you guys had our backs, you guys are BEAST and have a backup in case we weren’t there? That’s ill cause like, I was talking, and my phone rings, and it’s all, ‘You’re gonna’ be in this play,’ and I’m like ‘SHOOT!’ And I run to get here.”

Even in response to a question regarding their least favorite part of the project, students reinforced the importance of their function as students and demonstrating commitment to the performance, as is stated in the following excerpt:

6.84 Jeremy: “When like, some people didn’t want to do it and they took a half a day.”

Katzia: “When we didn’t get our act together. Like, we were acting stupid and messing around. Seriously, after a while, it was like, ‘C’mon you guys.’”

In interview, students identified the community experienced in the class and its effect on the project’s outcomes as the element that would “stick in their minds.”

- 6.85 Jesus: “Uh, uh, probably the ability to have, like, total strangers come together and like, get to know each other and actually become friends. They’re doing, uh, something together....we were all striving for a common goal, which was to do the best job that we could.... In the beginning, the group was more shy, they kept to themselves, and then by the end, everyone was opening up, put their personality into what they were doing so it made the play that much better.”
- 6.86 Katzia: “Collaboration. Ya’ know, pretty much coming together as one and the issues behind our stories and how they speak to others...I don’t know, in this world in these days it’s kinda’ hard to like interact with other people because we’re all so different. So when we come together as one and we are different ages, um, different class grades, races, ethnicities. It’s kinda’ like a beautiful thing.”
- 6.87 Jeremy: “What will stick into my mind? I would have to say working with everybody all together and teachers also... Because it was...I guess... don’t get me wrong the message was clear but it would’ve not have been possible without everyone wasn’t around. If everybody wasn’t working together.”
- 6.88 Brian: “The whole team work, the whole bonding, the whole friendship, the whole changing people’s lives. It’s just like the whole experience itself just working together. All that stuff. Becoming a family, becoming as one.”

I also asked the students, in interview, if they felt that the class worked better together doing this than they usually do.

6.89 Katzia: “Yeah, because at first I didn’t notice the differences-it was step by step. And we had our own little cliques or we didn’t want to do this with certain people or whatever. But at the end we was able to just come together no matter what the interruptions were and just work it all out.”

6.90 Jeremy: “Definitely yes. I know, I know, I know Brian for personally doesn’t work really well with other people and I seen him working really good, like, with other people.”

Even the most reluctant students, and there were some, ultimately performed well. Richard is a case in point. Richard was assigned to the Drama 2 class to fulfill his fine arts requirement. He was a freshman, though he should have been a sophomore. He had lived with his crack-addicted mother for two years during which “school was the last thing on his mind.” He had refused to participate in the Drama 2 class at the start of the semester, and continued to refuse at the start of the playmaking project. He sat in the second row for the first two weeks of the development of the piece, until I suggested that he film sequences of the work for us. I brought in a video camera for him to use, and he picked it up very quickly. By the end of the project, he had helped create props, taped monologues for projection and ran them during the performance, and videotaped the post-project interviews. He took full leadership in the booth where

we filmed, telling the various performers where to look, how long to wait to get started, etc. He called me when they were done, and came down to ask the next student to come up to the booth. It was a noticeable step forward. Further, he began to risk sharing his opinion about the theatrical viability of various choices and performances.

6.91 After Jasmin did her big piece on Monday, Richard pulled me aside and asked me if I thought we should film her doing the smaller piece, too. I asked him what he thought. He said, “Jasmin has more expression on her face and says it with more feeling. I think we should film her doing it.” So we did.

6.92 Richard: “I think it plays better if Ruby wears the cash mask the whole time.”

Richard was proud of his engagement and leadership. One morning when we were creating fake joints and foil-clad balls of crack, he called out to a student teacher, pointing at the “joint” he was rolling. “Look, Miss!” he said proudly, “I’m participating!”

6.10 Anti-Community- Negative Cases

I coded the observation data, interviews, post-project reflections and member checks for anti-community. There were several relatively common examples of anti-community behavior in the group, mostly demonstrated during games. For example, JR and Jorge, who were friends, stood out of the action

during Amoeba Tag, and during Extreme Rock/Paper/Scissors, Nick never ran or moved, regardless of whether his group had won or lost the round. As I mentioned earlier, the students had been together as a class for a month at this point, but still didn't all know each others' names.

Much of the anti-community coding revolved around Nick and Jorge. Nick was a graduating senior who engaged very little in the development and rehearsal process, but did well during the performance. In his member check, he stated several times that:

6.93 Nick: "I personally didn't share anything..."

yet he also acknowledged the "sense of teamwork" in the class, and his own desire to perform well because "we didn't want to disrespect each other by not taking their story seriously or putting on a bad performance." He also came to be interviewed, even though he had already graduated. I don't know why.

Jorge was another source of anti-community coding. At risk of pathologizing him, Jorge was a crack addict with severe attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. He often wandered the stage with both hands down the front of his baggy pants. Jorge was most engaged in the development process when I asked for suggestions for music. He offered several Styles P songs and I used one in the show, which seemed important to him. But when I asked the students to write a monologue about a time they'd taken control of their lives, Jorge came up to Amy and me, agitated. "I'm not writing fucking shit about my life!" We suggested he make something up, and he looked puzzled but he did it.

Jorge was the only student not engaged by the collective action images, as his contribution to a discussion of their motivation for protesting demonstrates:

6.94 Jorge: “They’re a bunch of Mexicans. Well, they are!”

Michael: “That was incredibly racist.”

Jorge was arrested during the rehearsal period and was escorted from the class to a waiting police officer at one point, missing rehearsal for the next several days, yet he showed up for the performance and knew his lines, and called JR to remind him to come for the performance. Why? I don’t know.

The third area of anti-community coding focused on the three special education students with very limited English, Tatiana, Leyla, and Jovanna. Tatiana spoke the most English and was the most integrated with the class. Leyla and Jovanna, sisters, spoke very little and understood almost no English. They still participated in scene development in mostly peripheral roles, with students demonstrating and modeling what they wanted them to do, but they were not well integrated in the class. However, in a scene in which Tatiana was supposed to beg for her life, when she finally threw herself into it begging, “No, please don’t kill me!” instead of speaking the line in a monotone, the students broke into spontaneous applause.

The most complicated aspect of anti-community occurred during the rehearsal process between Amy and the boys in the class. Only one of the students in the class had been in a play before, and the processes of rehearsing were unfamiliar to them. Amy is considered tough but fair by the students, as was reflected in the preliminary study and Phase One data, but as a director, she used

more stick than carrot in her approach to them, and was quick to identify strong performers, both as a recognition of them and a nudge to the others. Tension rose, especially among the boys, who felt it was unfair as Amy commented on their backstage behavior when assessing their participation in the play. Amy, too, was irritated, and told me several times that this isn't the behavior she expects from them towards her. Both the students and Amy seemed to feel that this was a betrayal of their relationship. The tension was expressed publicly in a series of escalating interactions with Anthony, who was a particular favorite of Amy's and had taken other classes with her.

6.95 Amy: (*To Anthony*) "Anthony, are you going to come up here today and participate?"

Anthony: (*Annoyed*) "Hmm. I don't know..."

Amy: "Well, can you decide? Because the rest of us are kind of relying on you to be up here or not."

Anthony: "Okay, NO."

Anthony resisted and refused periodically throughout the rest of the rehearsal process, and his girlfriend, Maria, stayed with him. We found out later that the students were grumbling backstage about Amy. Many of the boys are attracted to her, and responded as though they were being disrespected by a girlfriend.

I think that there were a number of factors informing these dynamics. One was my presence as Amy's former professor and mentor. Her desire to do well 'for me' caused her to push the students in ways that were harsher than her usual

approach to them. Another factor was her desire for them to do justice in performance to what they'd created in process, which she told me in a post-project discussion. The lack of positive recognition caused some students to doubt whether they could perform the play, and to question how it would be received. As Michael said to me at one point:

6.96 Michael: "I hope I graduate before this thing happens."

The final component that presents itself as a negative case occurred through the member check. While most of my initial findings were vetted by the students, the one consistent exception occurred in the item which read: "I think the theatre project asked you to share parts of yourself that you usually wouldn't, and you did it partly because you want to be known by other people." All of the students agreed with the first part of the sentence (I think the theatre project asked you to share parts of yourself that you usually wouldn't) but six disagreed with the second (you did it partly because you want to be known by other people). The two students who expanded on their answers offered the following:

6.97 Nick: "I personally didn't share anything, but I think other people wanted their stories to be known."

6.98 Ruby: "I did it to benefit other people. I'd never show this to my father. It would hurt him. He doesn't know I did this. I don't think my mother knows. But people need to know that bad things happen. I've seen a lot of things I probably shouldn't have seen. People need to know that even if

terrible things happen in your life, the rest of your life doesn't have to be terrible.”

It's interesting to me that for Ruby, social conscience (a manifestation of Communal Power Orientation) informed her choice to share her lived experiences, and her Sense of Community with her family made her want to shield them from the same knowledge.

6.11 Applied Theatre and Community

...community...like freedom, it has to be achieved by persons offered the space in which to discover what they recognize together and appreciate in common; they have to find ways to make intersubjective sense (Greene, 1995, p.39).

Applied Theatre and Drama facilitate the development of community (Gallagher, 2007; Cahill, 2002; Nelson, Colby & McIlrath, 2001; Wagner, 1998; Manley and O'Neill, 1997; Neelands, 1990) in a world in which community is increasingly difficult to find and maintain (Sennett, 2003; Bauman, 2001). Bauman (2001) challenges the value of community today, addressing at length a current conception of community as restrictive, controlling, and lacking in the unconditional support present in the past (p.10). Bauman identifies a current trend toward superficial communities that are perfunctory and transient, which don't 'weave a web of ethical responsibilities and long term commitments' (p.71). He

calls aesthetic communities, such as those developed through shared aesthetic experiences, “peg communities” (p.71) (hang a common problem on the peg, then move it later).

I’d argue that this is not accurate for the students in the Drama 2 class, who scaffolded the aesthetic community established in this AT/D project on home cultures that reflect the importance of community as a held value (Ladson-Billings, 2009; Macedo & Bartolomé, 1999; Nieto, 1999). The community established in the Drama 2 class shares characteristics with what Bauman (2001) calls a community of choice, characterized by “long-term commitments, inalienable rights, and unshakeable obligations” (p.72). Though establishing the durability of the community engendered in this project would require longitudinal data that is beyond the scope of this research, the students involved spoke at length about the importance of the community which was established during the experience and the trust they placed in their classmates. This reflects Weeks’ (2000) assertion that “trust and commitment have to be worked at in relationships that no one dictates should last unless individuals choose to make them last” (in Bauman, 2001, p.99). All students interviewed identified the community established in the group as a component that they would remember about the project, and identified that community as a critical factor in their accomplishment of the finished product. They identified the nature of the community as distinct from their experiences in other classes, and the sharing of personal stories of struggle and triumph as key to the establishment of trust in the group.

6.99 Brian: “Well, since he said something maybe I could say something too.

It’s a very closed and secure class; that’s why what we said never left

anywhere. Nobody, I didn't hear nobody saying, 'Oh, I heard this in drama class...' Like everybody knew to keep their mouth shut. They knew this was a very secure and secretive place... That's why people came out... That's why they were like, I can say this or that, because I trust you people... They trusted everybody."

6.100 Jesus: "...total strangers come together and like, get to know each other and actually become friends."

6.101 Gianni: "... all the people here in the beginning like they hardly knew each other and it just like brought everybody together. Like their lives....Because the play like, like it made everybody tell the truth about themselves...you see like what people really are and not their image."

According to Bauman (2001), "Ghetto life does not sediment community... Sharing stigma and public humiliation does not make the sufferers into brothers; it feeds mutual derision, contempt, and hatred...'to be more like them' means to be more unworthy than I already am" (p.121). However for the students in Drama 2, sharing their stories seemed to bring them into community and made them feel stronger, both as individuals, as is demonstrated in the following excerpt from a post-project interview,

6.102 Bethany: " Name one thing you think you've learned from this experience."

Ruby: “I don’t know. Like, I learned more about myself kind of? Um, I’m a very, like, private person and I opened up a lot. And I really don’t do that.”

Bethany: “What do you think it was in the experience that made you do that?”

Ruby: “That the whole experience was just about the truth. And that’s what we wanted people to know: the truth. That no matter how messed up your life is, you can always overcome that, and a lot of people don’t show the bad part of their life, and they always think that that person succeeded because they had the most wonderful life in the world, and they really didn’t.”

Bethany: “Is there anything you know now that you didn’t know before that you’re glad you know?”

Ruby: “Uh, yeah kind of, like, that I kind of took control of my, like, self, and my life. And that, I didn’t really notice it before. So.”

Bethany: “Um, is there anything that you know now that you didn’t know before that you wish you didn’t know?”

Ruby: “I don’t know. Maybe that, too. That I have control of my life, because that’s kind of scary and I have to make my decisions for me.”

and as a group.

6.103 Gianni: “... our school is like different than like other communities like out there...Like we...like some communities like they’re like normal like they seem normal but ours is like it’s, like, deep.”

6.104 Katzia: “It gives other people a chance to see what, ya know, what you go through as a human being. Life is not that easy and we do know that stress and depression and suicide and all this other crazy stuff that’s going on in the world cuz we walk through it everyday... You may think you’re the only one going through what you’re going through, but there’s plenty of other people out there. All you gotta’ do is say what you gotta’ say and others will like come.”

I asked each student to write a sentence/idea that they’d like me to include in the introduction to the show that told the audience what they thought it was important for them to know. The ideas offered reflect the strengths of AT/D for building community, inviting participants to share their reality in the context of a wider sociological frame, and consider the possibility of their own agency in changing the dynamics explored (Prentki and Preston, 2009; Prendergast and Saxton, 2009; Nicholson, 2005), as the following excerpts demonstrate.

6.105 Michael: “In this play are the actual events of students’ lives.”

6.106 Jorge: “This is Chelsea.”

6.107 Jeremy: “The world isn’t what you think it is.”

6.108 Brian: “This is a life changing show.”

In interview, I asked students what they think was meant by the student who wrote, ‘This is a life changing show.’ The following responses point to both their personal investment in the material performed and their belief in its potential impact on the audience.

6.109 Wendy: “It’s probably...just make you realize everyone else goes through the same thing, everyone else has the same problems and everyone else wants the same rights.”

6.110 Ruby: “Life-changing, probably to the people who seen it. Because, probably like, they were a lot, like, narrow-minded, not open to this type of living... And...everything in the show was basically real. We experienced it, we lived it, and it’s still in our memory and it’s always gonna’ be there.”

6.111 Katzia: “Life changing show...hmmm...um...it was about life...so, and all of our lives, and I felt like, I felt like every piece that was put into it, it changed every single one of us and the people that we performed it for. So their lives were affected and changed because of it from our experiences, which was our life that we was performing.”

For students whose home cultures have a strong community orientation and who are primarily denied a sense of positive community ties in the white, middle class dynamics of their schooling (Ladson-Billings, 2009; Macedo & Bartolomé, 1999), the establishment of community in school settings may be an

important tool for student engagement and function. The role of community was an unanticipated foundational component of the outcome of this research that was connected, according to the participants, to their emerging understanding of societal discrimination and the need for change, as well as their sense of themselves as people with something to say that deserves to be heard.

6.12 Limitations of the Analysis

In this phase of the project, the strengths and limitations of the data analysis are conflated. The playmaking experience was an 8 week project in which deeply personal experiences were shared and in which I got to know the students, and they, in a limited way, got to know me. Ironically, the same dynamic which generated an overwhelming volume of raw data also positioned me, as a researcher, with a more informed perspective on what I was seeing. Having observed the dynamics of the class at length and in a variety of situations, and having interacted frequently with the students as individuals and as a group, I have a more comprehensive frame of reference for interpreting behavior and decoding discourse. However, I, too, was impacted by this experience.

The sheer volume of data made identifying themes and selecting excerpts difficult, as I was confronted with the challenge described by Neelands (2006) in which “teaching is research and research is practice” (p.25), in which “knowledge and its selection are neither neutral nor innocent” (p.23), and “what we see is what we see” (p.33). Mauthner and Doucet (2003) point to the importance of “recognizing the social location of the researcher as well as the ways in which our emotional responses to respondents can shape our interpretations of their accounts” (p.418), and identify the “complex processes of representing the

‘voices’ of respondents...through the researcher who makes choices about how to interpret these voices and which transcript extracts to present as evidence” (ibid, p.418). I have turned to the words, scenes, and actions of the students as much as possible, but end this project with the acknowledgement that the “act of theorizing is not an imposition of abstract theories upon vacuous conditions. Theorising is a form of engagement with and intervention in the world” (Britzman, 1991, p.55).

6.13 Conclusion

The following excerpt describes the discussion of one of the physicalizations of the collective action images, as students reflected on the meaning of the physical dynamics of the scene.

6.112 T: “Why is David standing like that with his arms crossed?”

Brian: “To show strength.”

Katzia: “I’m still here, I’m right here beside you.”

Michael: “We’re together! Fight for your rights together!”

T: “Why is Maria holding it [the sign] up?”

Jeremy: “To remember the day.”

T: “Why would they want to remember the day?”

Julio: “To make a point. It could be the first day that they ever took a stand for something.”

We should think of education as opening public spaces in which students, speaking in their own voices and acting on their own initiatives, can identify themselves and choose themselves in relation to such principles as freedom, equality, justice, and concern for others. (Greene, 1995, p.68)

This playmaking experience offered students the opportunity to represent themselves in theatre, to speak about themselves for themselves. The students took risks, spoke about their personal and public experiences with discrimination, and supported one another as they embraced their strength as a group.

Reflecting the research questions which informed this project, they report having a deeper understanding of the social and cultural roots of their lived experiences. They report feeling powerful in the creation and presentation of the finished production. The experience resulted in the establishment of a community of influence and the exploration of cultural hegemony (Greene, 1995; Foucault, 1977; Arendt, 1958), which encouraged critical discourse and the re-imagining of the social good (Neelands, 2007; Apple and Buras, 2006; Gramsci, in Apple and Buras, 2006; Nicholson, 2005), as students examined the issues and inequities that inform their lives and proposed change that seemed to them to be within their power to enact.

Thorstein Veblen (2000) identifies the 'taste for effective work and a distaste for futile effort' that is common to all humans (p.15). Though I did not survey the audience members, the students in this project report feeling that the performance work they did was both effective in educating their audience and important for themselves. The sense of futility often present in their world was replaced by an interest in agency and a belief in the possibility of change. Most important was their perception that they had something important to say, and that people would listen when they said it, as the belief in one's power is a necessary starting point for all action (Galinsky, Gruenfeld, and Magee, 2003).

6.113 Brian: "...it takes like a little spark...just a little spark and a little flame will start to glow and then the flame will get bigger and bigger and bigger and it just takes somebody out there just to say something just to start it off."

Chapter 7

Conclusion

The very idea of intervention is implicated in issues of power and the right to speak on behalf of others... Despite these caveats, interventions on behalf of or with those whose voices are not normally heard in the societies they inhabit are a vital feature of applied theatre practice since they act as a counterweight to the myriad interventions of the dominant into the lives of us all (Prentki, 2009, p.181).

7.1 Introduction to the Conclusion

I approached this project with the intention of exploring whether and how Applied Theatre/Drama (AT/D) might be used to facilitate two aspects of best practice in multicultural education: 1) the need to teach explicitly about unequal power dynamics and develop curriculum that addresses issues of racism and discrimination, and 2) focus on social change that promotes equity for subordinated groups and facilitates the development of the skills and knowledge needed to become agents of change (Nelson, 2005). This three phase study utilized Boal-style exercises, process drama, and playmaking, respectively, with three different drama classes of urban students of color from Chelsea High School. I think they learned something through this experience; I learned a lot.

7.2 Research Questions

The research questions informing this study focused on the role of these different forms of AT/D for developing an understanding of 1) how students define and wield power (How do students define power? How do power dynamics affect them in school, at home, at work, and in the world?); 2) how AT/D might affect students' understanding of unequal power dynamics (What are the effects of process drama/playmaking on facilitating students' understandings

of unequal power dynamics, as reflected in cultural hegemony and unequal distribution of resources in their lives? What are the effects of integrating social and labor history with contemporary themes in creating a context for understanding current unequal power dynamics?); 3) how AT/D might affect students' understandings and skills relative to collective action, advocacy, and social change (In what ways can teaching labor history from the past affect students' constructions of collective action in the present? What are the effects of using playmaking structures to facilitate students' identity formation as change agents in the issues that affect their lives? How can students acquire advocacy skills through participation in a playmaking experience?); and 4) the role of community as a factor in the learning dynamics of urban students of color (In what ways does the community established in the drama classroom affect students' engagement and facility with the material?).

7.3 Research Methodology

This was a qualitative study using participant observation (Patton, 2002, p.81) as a primary form of data collection followed by ethnographic interviews “to understand the shared experiences, practices, and beliefs that arise from shared cultural perspectives” (Brenner, 2006, p.358). This structure generated information rich case studies. Case study, “the study of the particularity and complexity of a single case, coming to understand its activity within important circumstances” (Stake, 1995, p.xi), is a form that lends itself to educational drama research, as the methods of case study “can chime with the forms of knowledge generated by the art form of drama itself” (Winston, 2006, p.43). These case studies were developed in a social constructivist frame, with the goal of “deeply

understanding specific cases within a particular context” (Patton, 2002, p.546).

The social constructivist perspective emphasizes “the social world . . . as socially, politically, and psychologically constructed” and offers “perspective and encourage(s) dialogue among perspectives rather than aiming at singular truth and linear prediction” (Patton, 2002, p.546).

My emphasis was on the development of grounded theory, the process of generating theory rather than researching a particular theoretical content.

Grounded theory generally refers to “theory that is inductively generated from fieldwork, that is, theory that emerges from the researcher’s observations and interviews out in the real world rather than in the laboratory or academy” (Patton, 2002, p.11). The analysis of the data followed an inductive process, in which most hypotheses and concepts came from the data and were systematically worked out in relation to the data in the course of the research (Patton, 2002, p.125). Coding procedures helped provide some “standardization and rigor” (Strauss and Corbin, 1998, p.13) to the analytical process, as did the search, through the use of alternative coding categories, for opposing theories to explain the outcomes.

Stake (1995) acknowledges that “it is true that in case study we deal with many complex phenomena and issues for which no consensus can be found as to what really exists- yet we have ethical obligations to minimize misrepresentation and misunderstanding” (p.108). In the case of my research, each component of the study suggested possible categories and themes that informed my content, coding categories and subsequent analysis. In addressing the raw data for each component, I developed both open and axial codes. I employed three forms of triangulation suggested by Stake (1995), investigator triangulation, theory

triangulation, and methodological triangulation, as well as triangulation of sources as suggested by Patton (2002), checking the consistency of different data sources within the same method (interviewing multiple participants, for example) (p.556).

The design of this project also reflects Critical Change Theory (Brenner, 2006; Patton, 2002), in which qualitative inquiry is “a form of critical analysis aimed at social and political change,” (Patton, 2002, p.548) approaching fieldwork and analysis with “an explicit agenda of elucidating power, economic, and social inequalities” (ibid, p.548). The criteria defining this approach “flow from critical change theory, feminist inquiry, activist research, and participatory research processes aimed at empowerment” (Patton, 2002, p.543). They include: increasing consciousness about injustices; identifying the nature and sources of inequalities and injustices; representing the perspective of the less powerful; making visible the way those with more power exercise and benefit from power; engaging those with less power respectfully and collaboratively; building the capacity of those involved to take action; identifying potential change-making strategies; praxis; and a clear historical and values context.

In the design, implementation, and data analysis components of the project, I strove for researcher reflexivity, defined by Finlay (2002) as “thoughtful, conscious self-awareness” marked by the “continual evaluation of subjective responses, intersubjective dynamics, and the research process itself” (p.532) in order to recognize “how we actively construct our knowledge” (p.532), in an effort to transform “subjectivity from a problem to an opportunity” (p.531). According to Hertz (1997), “The reflexive ethnographer does not simply report ‘facts’ or ‘truths’ but actively constructs interpretations of his or her experiences in the field and then questions how those interpretations came about,” (Hertz,

1997, p.viii) having “an ongoing conversation about the experience while simultaneously living in the moment” (ibid, p.viii).

As a teacher-researcher engaged in practice-which-is-research (Neelands, 2006), I also focused on reflective practice, the goal of which is to “problematise the curriculum in terms of what and whose knowledge is valued and in terms of how inclusive and equitable the curriculum is for students who do not belong to the culture of power” (p.25), in order to “equip students both with the knowledge needed to be powerful and a critical consciousness of how power operates...” (ibid, p.25).

For critical theorists, reflective practice is an emancipatory project... which seeks to empower teachers as agents of social change engaged in a process of first exposing and then, through their own politicization and agency, moving from an authoritarian and elitist model of schooling towards a social democratic model (Neelands, 2006, p.23-4).

Finally, the project as conducted reflected the importance of educational research as an applied form of inquiry, that should “first and foremost, be useful, serving the purpose of educational improvement, of bettering practice through enhanced understanding” (Winston, 2006, p.42).

7.4 Data Collection

In each phase of the project I was a participant observer, though to varying degrees in different components of the study. In the Preliminary Study, I co-designed the lesson, observed while Amy taught it, then interviewed 11 of the participants. In Phase One, I designed the process drama lessons, modeled their teaching in another class, and observed Amy as she taught the same lessons with the F Block students, occasionally taking a role, advising students on their scene development, or leading warm-up games. In Phase Two, I designed the

playmaking structures, co-taught them with Amy, led the technical crew during rehearsals and performance of the play (which Amy directed), and conducted post-project interviews with 15 of the participants. Cohen and Manion (1980) identify the advantages of participant observation in case study research, as it allows for gathering of both verbal and non-verbal data, allows the investigator to note behavior in real time as it emerges, and enables the researcher to develop a more intimate and informal relationship with research participants (pp.103-104).

Data collected and analyzed include my notes on events in classes and my post-project reflections; data provided by Bevin, the ethnographer during Phases One and Two, in the form of raw and cooked notes and her post-project reflection; by Amy in post-class discussions and in a post-project interview; and in student writings and interviews. (In both the Preliminary Study and Phase Two, observation and data collection during the drama interventions were followed by ethnographic interviews in a standardized, open-ended format (Brenner, 2006). According to Patton (2002), we interview people to “find out from them those things we cannot directly observe” (p.340), such as thoughts, feelings and intentions, in an effort to more fully understand “how people have organized the world and the meanings they attach to what goes on in the world” (p.341). I found the interviews helpful in capturing “how those being interviewed view their world, to learn *their* terminology and judgements, and to capture the complexities of *their* individual perceptions and experiences” (Patton, 2002, p.348).)

7.5 Critique of the Project

In considering the limitations of my particular research, I will address areas of concern regarding the methods I employed, the limitations of analysis in

each component of the study, and, through a comparative discussion of the three components of the project, a broader question about the nature of praxis and its effect on student “voice.”

7.5.1 Critique: Methods

The methods I employed for each component of the project built on the lessons I learned in the prior component(s). For example, in conducting the Preliminary Study, I had three important realizations:

- 1) I was unprepared for the range of reactions to my presence onstage, as I listened to the students plan; some were welcoming and relaxed, others noticeably inhibited and silenced by my presence. I felt I needed to develop the “more intimate and informal relationship” identified by Cohen and Manion (1980, p.103) in order to most effectively gather data. As a result, I led some warm-ups and games with the students in Phase One before they started the process drama work, (even though Amy would be leading the class), and occasionally took on role or facilitated scene development during the drama work itself. While it didn’t eliminate the problem, it seemed to mitigate it, or perhaps it was simply a result of my presence with them over the substantially longer period of time (12 class periods) during which the process drama work was conducted.
- 2) I realized the need for investigator triangulation (Stake, 1995) for two reasons: the impossibility of obtaining a representative sampling of what was happening without more eyes and ears on the task, and the inevitable subjectivity that would result from my increased intimacy with the students (Mason, 1996). I employed an outside ethnographer familiar with the forms of applied theatre/drama used who took notes during each class.

I also met regularly with Amy to process events in a systematic way during the subsequent components of the project.

3) During the first interview I conducted, I realized that there was a danger of assuming a shared understanding, for both the interviewee and for me—my assumption that I understood what the student meant, in spite of our widely different social and cultural locations, and *her* equally problematic assumption that I understood what she meant, which caused her to abbreviate her answers and explanations, reflecting Finlay’s (2002) warning against assuming shared language and understandings, lest one miss “the point that there were differences” (p.537). It made the construction of even a qualified, site-specific, case-specific version of ‘truth’ difficult to achieve. As a result, I decided to add member checks of my early results to both subsequent phases of the project as an additional form of triangulation.

7.5.1.1 Phase One

During Phase One, I discovered the limitations of the survey tool I had created for establishing a baseline understanding of students’ attitudes about power, their interactions with power at school, home, and in the workplace, their awareness of societal manifestations of power, and their belief in its mutability. Though there were statistically significant shifts on a number of items, the brief open-prompt in the post-project survey made me aware that the students’ interpretation of the items was quite variable. For example, one student strongly agreed with the statement, “Money is the most important tool for gaining power,” but also stated: “In this survey it asks if money is an important tool for power and I disagree. I think is (sic) Education honestly.” Given the range of reading levels

in the class, the issues of second language speakers, the variety of cultures represented, and the small number of respondents, I considered the findings unreliable, and didn't include them in the data analysis, with the exception of the open prompt which asked students to share something they learned about power in their own words, as "open format questions are good for soliciting subjective data ...An obvious advantage is that the variety of responses should be wider and more truly reflect the opinions of the respondents" (Social Research Methods, 2009). The open format prompt and the final discussion, conducted after the surveys were completed, yielded richer, more detailed, and, I feel, more reliable information on students' reactions to the process drama work and what they felt they had learned. Consequently, I decided to return to interviewing as a vehicle for eliciting post-project data in Phase Two.

7.5.1.2 Phase Two

Mason (1996) identifies two ethical issues in qualitative research that can impact results: 1) the rich and detailed character of much qualitative research can mean intimate engagement with the public and private lives of individuals, and 2) the changing directions of interest and access during a qualitative study mean that new and unexpected ethical dilemmas are likely to arise during the course of your research (pp.166-7). These "ethical issues" were most evident during Phase Two, in which my combined role as teacher-researcher was both a strength and limitation of the method I employed in the playmaking component of the study. In the two previous components, I had designed the lessons but didn't teach them, though I was involved in a minor, occasional teaching role in the process drama work. In playmaking, I was the lead teacher during the 5-week development of original material, though Amy co-taught some sessions and directed the

production of the finished piece. During the development of material, students shared deeply personal stories from their lives, we experienced good days together and bad, and trust developed. I cannot claim that I ended the project with a neutral perspective towards the students or the work that they did. I had agreed to model the playmaking process for Amy, part of the reason for her interest in participating in the project, but it was definitely a complicating factor in maintaining a position of objectivity.

Further, it seems possible that the relationship affected the data generated in interview with the students, as, according to Beer (1997), “Interviews augment experience, rather than simply reflecting it. They alter meaning, instead of delineating it. They change people” (p.127). Bourdieu (1996), in discussing the interviewer/interviewee relationship, states that “it is, in all cases, a *social* relation” (p.18) in which “various kinds of distortion are embedded in the very structure of the relationship” (p.18) and have some effects on the results obtained, depending on the parameters that influence them. These distortions are amplified by social distance and the “linguistic capital” (ibid, p.19) of the interviewer relative to the subject, a condition that describes my dynamic with the students in Chelsea. However, according to Bourdieu (1996), “social proximity and familiarity in effect provide two of the social conditions of ‘non-violent’ communication” (p.20), so it seems possible that my familiarity with the students, my evolving understanding of their social location and life situations, and my close work with them in Phase Two of the project, may have generated a positive interview environment, allowing me to “mentally put [my]self in [their] place” (p.22). Whether students were more forthcoming due to our familiarity, or shaped their answers to please me, I can’t be sure. Although I will say that there was

notable consistency of response, even with students who were less comfortable with me.

7.5.2 Critique: Analysis

Each component of the study had challenges to the analysis of the data which were discussed in the data analysis chapters. They are reconsidered below:

7.5.2.1 Preliminary

The Preliminary Study was singularly narrow in its scope. The observation took place during one class session, with ethnography provided by me and, through post-class discussion, Amy, and yielded a very manageable quantity of data, but from a single perspective. The interviews clarified and expanded on my initial theories regarding the events observed in the class, however I was the sole investigator, and observed one group of students whom I had never met before. I coded and analyzed carefully, but do not suggest that the results of the Preliminary Study are anything but local in their implications.

7.5.2.2 Phase One

Phase One yielded a substantial body of data. The data includes my notes on a three-day pre-observation of the class and 12 class periods in which students engaged with the material through process drama structures, Bevin's raw and cooked notes, notes on regular discussions and a post-project discussion with Amy, and the open-prompt data from the post-project survey. The sheer volume of ethnographic data on this phase of the research made analysis a daunting task, as I struggled to balance the "holistic and meaningful characteristics" (Yin, 2003, p.2) of a real life event while still addressing my research questions. Process drama generates multi-layered work in the preparation and presentation of original scenes, and the question of subjectivity becomes quite complex when trying to

honestly identify “emergent themes” (Winston, 2006, p.58) and still include a full range of voices of the participants, some of whom shared their thoughts verbally, and some of whom enacted them. In deciding what to include, I followed Stake’s (1995) advice to “discover essences and then to reveal those essences with sufficient context, yet not become mired trying to include everything that might possibly be described” (p.84).

7.5.2.3 Phase Two

In this phase of the project, the strengths and limitations of the data analysis are conflated, as the 8 week experience both generated a massive volume of data and informed my understanding of the students and events in a way that gave me a more comprehensive frame of reference for interpreting behavior and decoding discourse. However, I, too, was impacted by this experience, as I discussed above.

As in Phase One, the sheer volume of data made identifying themes and selecting excerpts difficult. Mauthner and Doucet (2003) point to the importance of “recognizing the social location of the researcher as well as the ways in which our emotional responses to respondents can shape our interpretations of their accounts” (p.418), and identify the “complex processes of representing the ‘voices’ of respondents...through the researcher who makes choices about how to interpret these voices and which transcript extracts to present as evidence” (ibid, p.418). I have turned to the words, scenes, and actions of the students as much as possible, but end this project with the acknowledgement that the “act of theorizing is not an imposition of abstract theories upon vacuous conditions. Theorising is a form of engagement with and intervention in the world” (Britzman, 1991, p.55).

In conclusion, I make no claims as to the generalisability of these findings. The outcomes of my research reflect the experiences of these urban students in Chelsea High School in 2007-09. Replication of these studies, led by other teachers with other urban students, would be necessary to confirm and validate my analysis and findings.

A comprehensive comparison of the three phases of the research seems unwarranted here, given the differences in the methods employed (resulting in substantial variations in the data gathered), time frames, and degree of student input on the outcomes. Further light may be shed on some of the outcomes however, by considering those themes that are present across the three components of the study. I have included brief excerpts to clarify for the reader elements which were discussed and supported at length in Chapters 4, 5, and 6.

The following discussion considers those shared aspects in relation to the literature on ideology in schools, community, power and action, and Communal Power Orientation discussed in Chapter 2.

7.6 Community

The students in all three components of the project consistently demonstrated a marked degree of community that, according to Amy and the students themselves, represents a substantial shift in their normal school behaviors. This was evident in their planning and presentation of material, and reflected in discussions and in interview. In the Preliminary Study, Phase One and Phase Two, students consistently demonstrated collaboration, seamlessly sharing leadership in the planning process for tableaux and scene work and taking joint responsibility for making sure everyone was included. In all classes, the

students listened to one another, shared jokes, and trusted each other with intimate personal stories. They touched without hesitation, and both boys and girls held hands during warm-up games without jokes or comments. In warm-up games they played cooperatively, even during high energy competitive games.

The students in the Preliminary Study and Phase One had been working together for 6 and 8 weeks, respectively, when the research was introduced, and the students had established relationships with each other and Amy, facilitated by three weeks (15 class periods) of community building work with which Amy begins every semester. Phase Two began less than a month after the start of the students' semester together, and their community was less developed, though still evident. In the post-project interviews conducted after the Preliminary Study and Phase Two, students commented on the importance of community, in the class and with their families, jobs, and friends, in both explicit and implicit ways.

7.1 Ricky: "We all just, like, even though we're not all really close friends, we all just get along. You know, like, no one's over here like stereotyping anyone or anything like that." (Preliminary)

7.2 Michael: "People make you feel comfortable, people make you feel like you can say anything to them, you know..." (Preliminary)

7.3 Jesus: "Uh, uh, probably the ability to have, like, total strangers come together and like, get to know each other and actually become friends. They're doing, uh, something together....we were all striving for a common goal, which was to do the best job that we could.... In the

beginning, the group was more shy, they kept to themselves, and then by the end, everyone was opening up, put their personality into what they were doing so it made the play that much better.” (Phase Two)

The scene work and discussions by students during the playmaking and process drama work reflect a similar emphasis on community as a held value.

7.4 Amy: “How is Extreme Rock/Paper/Scissors different from regular?”

Julio: “You’re not just picking for yourself, you’re picking for an entire group. When you’re wrong, your whole group is suffering for your mistake.” (Phase Two)

7.5 Amy: “What types of power did they have?”

Karen: “Willpower.”

Luis: “Power of love for family.” (Phase One)

7.6.1 The Self in Community

Arendt (1998) claims that the urge to tell one’s story, to communicate oneself, is a “primordial human impulse and *need* to answer the question “Who are you?” (p.178). The students’ desire to be themselves with their classmates, and to share their “stories,” seemed to be a result of the community in each class, as well as a factor in the continuing development of community among the students. Students in the Preliminary Study discussed this:

- 7.6 Michael: “I took this class because, this class, in many ways, lets you express yourself, you know? Say what is in your mind. And I think that’s important for kids, like, especially kids my age...and share with people how they feel.”
- 7.7 Angelica: “I just want to open up to people and show them who I am, in reality.”

as did those in the Phase Two:

- 7.8 Gianni: “Because the play like, like it made everybody tell the truth about themselves...Because you see like what people really are and not their image.”
- 7.9 Brian: “It takes a lot for someone to control their own life... And to hear other peoples’ experience about how they made themselves or how they are now is kinda’ crazy, because you compare how you made yourself and you compare how they made themselves and you kinda’ realize that there are similarities between a person even though you might not think there is.”

In Phase One, students demonstrated the importance of community during the Martin drama, and discussed its importance in their lives through the consideration of emigration and cultural solidarity in labor situations, though the community of the class itself was not explicitly discussed.

7.6.2 Teacher and Community

Amy was included in the community of the three classes participating in the project, and was identified by the students as “tough,” having high expectations, and listening to their opinions. This was communicated explicitly, in interview, as the following excerpt from the Preliminary Study demonstrates:

7.10 John: “She [Amy] does, like, actually pay attention to our opinions. And not just mine or his. To everyone’s.”

The students’ sense of community with her was also communicated implicitly, in students’ behavior towards her, as when, during the Preliminary Study, students rushed to help her clean up spilled sawdust. She was playful and funny with the students, and they with her. The following excerpt from Phase One is typical of the joking way she interacted with the upperclassmen.

7.11 Amy: “Somebody different want to start this time?”

Fernando’s hand goes up.

Amy: “Somebody different.”

Fernando: “I’m different.”

Amy: “I know you are.”

She laughs and so does he.

In all classes, the students actively recruited and pursued contact with her, inviting her to partner with them in games and asking for her help when they got stuck in a task. Further, they were able to ask Amy for help in creating scenes

when they needed it and politely refused her help when they didn't, as the following excerpt from Phase One demonstrates.

- 7.12 During the planning, Amy suggests something. Fernando says, "Well, Miss. Since when do you make all the decisions?" Amy: "Sorry. I'm just trying to expedite the process."

In interview, Amy discussed her focus on the importance of developing community in her classes.

- 7.13 Amy: "I want them to come and feel comfortable with me, with the space and with the other students so that's my major number one goal, and if I accomplish that then the other things are, like, the confidence, the being comfortable with sharing your story with other people and...that's pretty much it."

She reflects the perceptions of the students in describing herself as a teacher:

- 7.14 Amy: "I'm totally... I'm a hard ass, because I want respect for other kids in the class. I want everybody to feel like it's a safe place but I also want respect for my time because I throw a lot of my emotion into it... I sort of feel like, if I reveal enough about myself and I show that I care enough about the kids- everybody, everyone in the class- and I really do care about every kid; I care about all their likes and dislikes. I learn their name within

the first day... Things like that. When things like that happen, a community is built and respect is established.”

The community established and maintained in the three drama classes involved in the study stands in contrast to the ideology of community reflected in schools, as discussed in Chapter 2, and reviewed below.

7.6.3 Ideologies of Community

Ideological constructions of the role of community today work against the strengths and cultural beliefs of many urban students of color in public schools, and theorists on culturally relevant teaching agree on the importance of the establishment of community as a necessary factor for facilitating school success for urban students of color (Ladson-Billings, 2009; Tatum, 2003; Nieto, 2002; Macedo and Bartolomé, 1999; Lee, 1995). The establishment of community in the classroom and school environment reflects the communal orientation that characterizes the home cultures of many urban students, generates a sense of belonging for individual students, and allows them to scaffold new learning on familiar group dynamics. However, the ideology of individualization is prevalent in schools, in which students are encouraged to conceptualize themselves as single players in a sociological game, rising or falling on their own merits (Giroux, 2011; Bauman, 2008). Schools often discourage student community and foster an ethic of competition and individualization that works against achievement by urban students of color.

The liberal conception of freedom has led to a paradox: we have each chosen in our own interests, but the result is in no one's interest.

Individual rationality, collective irrationality (Singer on Marx, 1980, p.90).

Bauman (2001) paints a bleak picture of the current socioeconomic and cultural aspects of community, in which, in a culture of fear, “‘community’ stands for isolation, separation, protective walls and guarded gates” (p.114). However, Freire (1977) supports the need for collectivity, stating, “No one frees another. No one frees himself. People free themselves together” (p.58). It seems important to foster community in schools in which the next generation is inculcated with the ideologies which will, in part, shape their political beliefs and actions, either supporting the cultural hegemony which currently constrains their futures or challenging it. For students whose home cultures have a strong community orientation and who are primarily denied a sense of positive community ties in the white, middle class dynamics of their schooling (Ladson-Billings, 2009; Macedo & Bartolomé, 1999) the establishment of community in school settings may be an important tool for student engagement and function (Nelson, 2011).

7.7 Community and Power

The role of community, and its effect on the functioning of the classes, was an unanticipated foundational element in each of the research components. Literature on community and power, as discussed in Chapter 2, offers a lens through which to consider this dynamic. Psychology tells us that power has profound effects on all aspects of human functioning, and is a tool for personal

growth and social transformation (Keltner, Anderson, and Gruenfeld, 2003). Keltner et al. (2003) are most interested in the question of how power changes the behavior of the actor, with particular focus on the positive uses and effects of power for both the powerful and the powerless. In understanding the possible pro-social purposes of power, it is helpful to consider the connection between power and action, the importance of Sense of Community for psychological health, and Communal Power Orientation, as defined by Chen, Lee-Chai, and Bargh (2001).

People need to feel powerful in order to act (Galinsky, Gruenfeld, and Magee, 2003), and power and control, as defined by meaningful decision-making power, voice, and choice, is a physical and psychological wellness factor for children (Prilleltensky, Nelson and Peirson, 2001). According to Prilleltensky et al. (2001), the goal is to create communities in which individuals have enough power to satisfy their needs and work in concert with others to advance collective goals. Further, there is evidence that high power states stimulate goal-directed behavior, and that the possession of power leads directly to action (Galinsky, Gruenfeld, and Magee, 2003). Each of the drama classes in the study seems to fit the description of such a community, and the participation and engagement of the students in each phase seemed to be goal-directed behavior. The students' sense of power in the classroom community, as reflected in both their drama work and in self-report in interviews, allowed them to act, even though they were not always likely to take an active role in other school situations.

7.7.1 Voice

Students in the Preliminary Study and Phase Two explicitly identified the role of "voice" as a factor in their engagement with the AT/D structures. I will discuss Phase One relative to voice later in the chapter. In the Preliminary Study,

the importance of voice was a consistent thread in every interview. The students identified speaking your mind as a manifestation of power and a way of both taking and demonstrating power.

- 7.15 Yesenia: “If you don’t speak up, then you’re never really gonna’ have power. I think in order for you to have power you have to speak up for yourself and follow what you believe in.”

In the post-project interviews of Phase Two, students also regularly mentioned voice as their favorite part of the experience:

- 7.16 Ruby: “I liked the improv stuff. Like, we wrote our lines, and it was all the truth and we didn’t have to like, sugar-coat anything.”
- 7.17 Katzia: “Oh please. I’m just gonna’ open my mouth and say what I gotta’ say. That’s all it takes. I mean, as I said it the play, I have a right to be who I am.”

The use of first names in this document reflects the students’ commitment to sharing their “voices,” as all three groups requested that I not use pseudonyms in discussing the outcomes of the study.

7.7.2 Sense of Community

A possible answer to the question of why community is a source of power for the students in the study lies in an understanding of the psychological concept of Sense of Community, and a consideration of Communal Power Orientation.

Sense of Community (SOC), as defined by belonging, connectedness, influence, fulfillment of needs, and the importance of both having power and recognizing it, is acknowledged as a critical factor for psychological wellness (McMillan and Chavis, 1986; Adelson and O'Neil, 1966). All classes demonstrated a substantial, and in the case of Phase Two, increasing, degree of community (SOC) throughout the project. Factors identified by the students as critical components of their SOC in the Preliminary Study, and of their sense of power in the class, include voice and the freedom to be their 'true selves' and 'speak their minds.' In Phase Two, students identified the sharing of personal stories of struggle and overcoming as key to the development of SOC.

7.18 Katzia: "It gives other people a chance to see what, ya know, what you go through as a human being. Life is not that easy and we do know that stress and depression and suicide and all this other crazy stuff that's going on in the world 'cuz we walk through it everyday... You may think you're the only one going through what you're going through, but there's plenty of other people out there. All you gotta' do is say what you gotta' say and others will, like, come."

Chen, Lee-Chai and Bargh (2001), in a much cited study on relationship orientation as a moderator of social power, demonstrate that power is connected to social goals for individuals, and that high power states stimulate collective goal behavior in communally oriented individuals. The students in all classes demonstrated a communal orientation to the exercise of power in their behavior during the observations, and students in the Preliminary Study reflected

Communal Power Orientation (CPO) in post-project interviews. For example, in interview, in a response to the question, ‘When in your life do you feel the most powerful?’ the students identified helping roles as those that made them feel most powerful. The examples offered by the students share several features, including 1) a sense of being an important part of the function of a system, 2) having a higher degree of knowledge or competence than others in the situation, and 3) a moral imperative to contribute to the situation as a result of that competence. In Phase One, throughout the project, the students demonstrated the integration of power with the importance of community in scene work and discussion. In group work in the Martin drama, for example, the students repeatedly identified Martin’s social isolation as key to the despair that eventually motivated his suicide attempt. When asked to name the hand holding *them* back from suicide, they cited their relationships with family, parents, friends, and siblings.

The interaction of these three elements, constructions of power, Sense of Community, and Communal Power Orientation, offers insight into the potential gains for establishing community in schools among students of color, for whom the centrality of community is a held cultural value (Ladson Billings, 2009; Nieto, 2002; Macedo and Bartolomé, 1999).

Though the limited scope of the Preliminary Study makes it difficult to make a comprehensive statement regarding the interaction of community and power for the students, their function in the class, which was substantially different from their performance in many other classes according to Amy and the students themselves (in interview), suggests such an interaction. In Phase One, the students’ function as students seemed to be improved by the community of the class. This was evidenced in small ways, such as their retention of the process

work across multi-day breaks in the project (e.g. they still remembered their groups, their initial tableau and their second tableau after a day off during the Martin sequence- Amy was pleased and surprised), and in their commitment during climactic components of the process dramas (e.g. voicing the thoughts in Martin's head as he stood poised on the balcony in a somber and powerful vox popula, or the serious preparations for firing on the tent colony in the Ludlow Massacre sequence). This is typical of the risk-taking and mutual trust demonstrated by the group members throughout the project which resulted in well-constructed and effective theatre work.

In Phase Two, the SOC and power experienced by the students was demonstrated in their improved function as students through the development of original material and the rehearsal and performance of the finished script. A second indicator of the effect of community on student outcomes is that every student was present for the performance. This is not typical at Chelsea for a class-based project, according to Amy. Students repeatedly commented on the importance of community to the outcome of the project, as is demonstrated in the following excerpt. In response to the question: 'What were you proudest of the group for?' students responded:

7.19 JR: "We worked together."

Jeremy: "Everybody working together. Actually sticking to it and not being like, 'I'm done with this.'"

Katzia: "We were supportive of each other, giving encouragement."

Anthony: "When people didn't make fun of each other."

Katzia: "It came together."

7.20 Jeremy: “What will stick into my mind? I would have to say working with everybody all together and teachers also... Because it was...I guess... don’t get me wrong the message was clear, but it would’ve not have been possible without everyone wasn’t around. If everybody wasn’t working together.”

Of most interest to me is that, in Phases One and Two, the outcome of this research was connected, according to the participants, to their emerging understanding of societal discrimination and the need for change, as well as their sense of themselves as people with something to say that deserves to be heard. The opportunity to explore ideas about power in an environment in which their communal power orientation can be utilized as a pedagogical construct offers students the opportunity to explore, experience and wield power, in order to develop their identities as potential change agents (Nelson, 2009).

7.21 Brian: “I think it was everyone’s personality all together like everybody, like, they notice they could come out and be themselves so they’re like okay, come out of the shell, and we just had a whole bug out and different people have different personality. Like myself, always the clown, always make people laugh. And so you know they were really comfortable and... And idea’s came along.” (Phase Two)

7.8 The Ideology Dilemma

It is probably cultural inertia which still makes us see education in terms of the ideology of the school as a liberating force and as a means of increasing social mobility, even when the indications tend to be that it is in fact one of the most effective means of perpetuating the existing social pattern, as it both provides an apparent justification for social inequalities and gives recognition to the cultural heritage, that is, to a social gift treated as a natural one (Bourdieu, 1974, p.32).

Cultural hegemony in the United States generates inequity which permeates every level of our society. While publicly espousing an ideology of equity and equal opportunity as core values of our society that are supported and protected by our political system, we have tremendous disparities of wealth, opportunity, and achievement among our citizens, particularly along the dividing lines of race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status (Ladson-Billings, 2009; Fraser and Honneth, 2003; Tatum, 2003; Nieto, 2002; Macedo and Bartolomé, 1999; Greene, 1995; Lee, 1995; Goodlad, 1984). Change in these dynamics begins with a consideration of the ideologies which created, and now support, these dynamics.

If one accepts the Marxian idea that “human beings cannot be free if they are subject to forces that determine their thoughts, their ideas, their very nature as human beings” (Singer, 1980, p.46), and if we consider ideology as being both produced, by those in power in an effort to control others, and consumed, in complex and often self-defeating ways, by those without power, on both the conscious and subconscious level, (Freedman, 2003) then the importance of deconstructing and understanding the ideologies which govern thought and shape political processes is a crucial first step in generating social change directed towards more equitable outcomes, particularly those ideologies that frame and support what happens in schools and contribute to the gross differential in outcomes between low-income students of color and middle and upper class white

students (Ladson-Billings, 2009; Tatum, 2003; Nieto, 2002; Macedo and Bartolomé, 1999; Greene, 1995). We need to explore strategies for helping students deconstruct those ideologies, with the goal of bringing into conscious awareness components of thought that work against their achievement and success and trap them in a perpetual second class citizenship (Fraser and Honneth, 2003; Tatum, 2003; Nieto, 2002; Macedo and Bartolomé, 1999).

7.8.1 Student Constructions of Power

The three components of the project offered insight into students' constructions of power, communicated through tableau and scene work, in discussion, in writing, and in interview. Their initial ideas about power reflected both the prevailing social ideology (money, strength, authority, sex) and their lived experiences (family dynamics, God, police and other authority figures in school and in the world, gangs, and social power as reflected in friends and peers). In the Preliminary Study, students' tableaux and scenes demonstrated complex relationships in a variety of settings, such as the power of abuse in shaping a person's life in a family scene, the power of choice in a friends' scene, the power of revenge in a school scene, the power to resist drugs in a community scene, and the power of rejection in a world scene. In Phase Two, students explored a range of ideas through scene work, including family dynamics, school and peer interactions, social problems ranging from the drug trade to child abuse, joblessness, and the connection between wealth and power. After initial scene work exploring power in the students' school world (fist fights, food fights, work in a fast food restaurant), the connection between money and power became central in Phase One after the stock market dropped in October of 2008. This connection was, in a variety of ways, present in each phase of the research.

7.8.2 Money and Power

The Boal-style lesson of the Preliminary Study was designed to generate an understanding of students' constructions about power. In spite of the brief (80 minute) time frame, money was an element in students' understandings of power in tableaux and scenes, as in the following excerpt.

7.22 In the tableau, Edia held a gun to the head of Christine, who knelt in front of her, facing the audience, and pointed another at Olvin, who was holding money out towards her.

Amy: "Who has the power in this scene?"

Jazzmin: "Edia. She does. She has the gun."

Margarito: "Olvin has power 'cause he has the money."

Students' final stories also indicated the connection between money and power. For example, Angelica's story of a difficult custody choice between her mother and father reflected the importance of money as a factor in the decision.

7.23 Lyanna: (*a sister*) "He doesn't do anything for you."

Latisha: (*a sister*) "He doesn't even work. Why do you want to go with him?"

Margarito: (*father, as they leave*) "I'll buy you something nice."

Michael's story, of a situation in which he was disrespected by a sales clerk who questioned whether he could afford to purchase a \$200 shirt and offered to escort

him to the sale rack in the back room, ended with his closing line, “Do you want cash or credit?”

In interview, the role of money and power was discussed explicitly by students participating in the Preliminary Study.

7.24 Michael: “Money gives a lot of power to people.... It shouldn’t be like that.”

It was also implicitly identified, as in the following excerpt from Edia’s interview in which she talks about a “good” boss at her job at a supermarket.

7.25 Edia: “He’s, you know, you need any certain day off, you need to work more hours, you can just go straight up to him, tell him this, this and that is going on...Like right now, I had to go tell him, you know, you know, our, you know, things with money and everything. My mom just got operated a couple months ago, so... I told him, ‘Can I get a couple more hours?’ And it was like, ‘Yeah.’ Boost me up to 40 hours. So I was like, ‘Thanks.’”

The consideration of the interaction of money and power was forefronted in Phases One and Two. In the Martin Drama which began Phase One, students created scenes of poverty and homelessness in explaining how Martin ended up on the balcony at age 29, and these factors were integrated throughout as components of his despair and hopelessness. The bulk of the process drama work asked students to consider the connection between wealth and power, and between

poverty and powerlessness, as sociological dynamics. Students' understanding is reflected in the following excerpt, in which they consider the roots of conflict between wealthy owners and impoverished workers.

7.26 Fernando: "The rich are taking advantage of the poor people."

Erica: "It's hard for the poor people to climb higher because there aren't opportunities..."

Erica: "The poor people are going to try and do something about it to make things better..."

Armando: "The poor people want to be paid better. They can't go anywhere."

In their exploration of the Ludlow material, the students were able to reflect on the misrecognition and maldistribution (Fraser, 2003) that informed and inflamed the situation, to put themselves in the roles of those involved, and begin to draw parallels between their own socioeconomic positions and those of the miners. In the post-project survey, in response to the question: 'Name anything new you understand about power after this project,' students wrote about the interaction of power and money, which was also reflected in their scene work during the project.

7.27 DeeDee: "That most people have power only because they have what other people want."

Francisco: "That usually people used fear and money to get power."

Jacky: “After this project I started to think that power does have to do with having money. Throughout this project the people with money had power over the poor. I noticed that the poor had no money and no power.”

Phase Two also focused on the interaction between money and power, as reflected in control and violence. The role of money as a manifestation of social power, initially suggested by the students as a focus for the playmaking, was explored through scene work and monologue development, and discussed at length. In the following excerpts, students discuss the importance of money and its effect on people’s behavior.

7.28 Michael: “People get greedy with their money. They want more and more and they do stupid, crazy things to get more.”

T: “Why else do money, meanness and violence go hand-in-hand so often?”

Julio: “People don’t care what they do to get money.”

JR: “It’s an everyday thing that you NEED.”

Julio: “Without it, you can’t do anything. You can’t go anywhere. You can’t help yourself, you can’t feed yourself.”

7.29 Lemmy: “If you don’t have money, you’re nobody and can’t go to places like restaurants, the simple things in life.”

Julio: “Money runs the world. If you don’t have it... nothing’s free.”

Ruby: “Money makes you. If you have money, you can move to the suburbs, be safe, send your kids to good schools. They can make

something of themselves. If you don't have money, you're lucky to get those things."

In post-project interviews, students in Phase Two spoke about the interaction of money and power as something they learned during the experience.

7.30 David: "Money can really rule people's lives and it can help their lives. That's what I learned. I didn't think money was that important but I just found out it is...I didn't know that this could happen with money. I didn't want to know that money can corrupt people's minds. It's horrible to see what people can do with money. How they think they are."

7.31 Brian: (Pause.) "Like the whole... people came in here...I don't know if I should but, in my mind, they came in here looking at life as their own way; they don't really know what's going on around the world...So if people came to the show and they see like what were trying to say like the message and purpose they like, ya know, oh, this is true. I mean I never looked at life the way they're telling me about it. I never looked at the negativity of what it is to have power or how money rules..."

7.9 Contested Spaces

Gramsci (in Apple, 1995) states that hegemony is always contested (p.147), and LaClau and Mouffe (1985) argue that the social order only seems fixed; in reality it is constructed or articulated by us. If, as Freeden (2003) contends, "ideologies are not large, unified monoliths but a jigsaw of components

that make its definition quite flexible” (p.44), and if, as Donaldo Macedo, in the introduction to Freire’s (1993) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, states,

men and women develop their power to perceive critically the way they exist in the world with which and in which they find themselves; they come to see the world not as a static reality but as a reality in the process of transformation (p.12),

then ideological hegemonies can, in theory and practice, be successfully contested, “recast as engines of change and renewal, not just as unbending instruments of dominance” (Freeden, 2003, p.44).

By exploring the ideologies that inform their social reality, such as the relationship between money and power, students in all three phases of the project may have moved a step away from their roles as “unconscious consumers” (Freeden, 2003, p.20) to a more informed understanding of the dynamics in play. Though the Preliminary Study offered only a passing glance at these constructs, they were present in student work and discussion, and, in Phases One and Two the students explored the role of misrecognition extensively, particularly as a factor pertaining to immigrants and the urban poor, as mutually imbricated with maldistribution of resources in maintaining existing hegemonic ideologies.

7.9.1 Misrecognition and Maldistribution

Fraser’s (2003) construction of two-dimensional subordinated groups which “suffer both maldistribution and misrecognition *in forms where neither of these injustices is an indirect effect of the other, but where both are primary and co-original*” (p.19), is an example of an ideology applied in action, and she employs justice as a concept which brings maldistribution and misrecognition together in the pursuit of a greater good. According to Fraser, misrecognition is an issue of social status, and the social status model of recognition-misrecognition “constitutes an institutionalized relation of *subordination* and a

violation of justice” (ibid, p.29), in which status subordination is “a matter of externally manifest and publicly verifiable impediments to some people’s standing as full members of society” (ibid, p.31). And since class structure “institutionalizes economic mechanisms that systematically deny some of its members the means and opportunities they need in order to participate on a par with others in social life” (ibid, p.48), “by construing misrecognition as a violation of justice, it facilitates the integration of claims for the redistribution of resources and wealth” (ibid, p.33). According to Fraser, justice is served by both redistribution and recognition in an effort to establish norms of “participatory parity” (ibid, p.33) for currently disempowered people, and she asserts that we need both a politics of redistribution and recognition in order to solve the problem.

Student awareness of the conflation of misrecognition and maldistribution is a shared element in the three phases of the project, both enacted/performed and discussed. Students in the Preliminary Study had aspects of misrecognition embedded in their scene work, as they depicted characters like themselves in interactions with the police, in school (pitted against school authority figures in the form of the principal and security guards), and in the world (confronted by rude store personnel). In interview, students talked about the way they are perceived by others, as in Michael’s story of Spanish-speaking immigrants on the bus who are called “Spics,” or in the following excerpt from Edia’s interview.

7.32 Edia: “And Hector Morales, I guess he had his ipod or MP3 out and one of the teachers said, ‘Put it away.’ And he was folding it up and putting it away in his pocket. And I guess the teacher was walk, like, walked with him toward our history class. And they really got into a fight. And Dante

interfered and was like, ‘Hector, stop bein’ a bitch!’ you know, over it, and the teacher said, ‘Did you just call me a bitch?!’ He was like, ‘No, I didn’t Miss!’ ...And then the whole class defended him...”

The role of immigrant status and poverty as factors in misrecognition were explicitly forefronted in Phase One, through process drama work that addressed inequitable employment practices, past and present. The following discussion identifies students’ understandings of the interaction of maldistribution and misrecognition in 1914 Colorado, as they reflected on what they noticed about the socioeconomic circumstances of Rockefeller’s and the miners’ lives.

7.33 Bonnie: “The rich people get education.”

Mo: “Money gets you power.”

Amy: “You think money is power? What does money get you?”

Luis: “Everything!”

In scene and movement work exploring contemporary dynamics, students demonstrated their understanding of the conflict between the wealthy owners and the impoverished workers, whom they frequently depicted as Spanish-speaking immigrants. In the final discussion, when asked to name one thing they would remember from the project, students explicitly identified the connection between immigrants and poor working conditions, as the following excerpt demonstrates.

7.34 Heba: “How they treated poor people.”

Karen: “How people get treated at these jobs. Especially immigrants.”

Tracie: “The desperation of the people that they would just take that job.”

Tamar: “How another group of people were discriminated against, not just black people.”

Francisco: “How badly they needed the jobs.”

Silvia: “Not just the immigrants, but the poor people had to stay in bad situations for the money.”

Stephanie: “How they treated poor people.”

The participants in Phase Two also integrated their understanding of race and ethnicity as factors in poverty, which was reflected in desperate choices (drug dealing, murder) and demeaning, low-paying employment, as demonstrated in the following scene.

7.35 *(Nick is getting his shoes shined. JR and Jorge enter and sit down.)*

JR: “Ya, I made \$700,000 today.” *(to Gianni)* “Hey! Shine my friend’s shoes.”

(Gianni starts.)

JR: “Hey, you missed a spot. Do better. Clean the other one.”

(She finishes.)

JR: “Do you take plastic?”

Gianni: “No.”

JR: “Then you ain’t getting’ paid.”

In interview, in response to the prompt: ‘Name one thing you learned from this experience,’ students commented on their increased understanding of the societal scope of the problems they face.

7.36 Katzia: “It’s pretty much runned by everything. Not jus’ one thing. Like everything ties in...like money is a big part, or your color of your skin, or whether or not you’re a boy or girl, or your background. Everything ties in. And it runs your entire world.”

7.10 Schools as Contested Spaces

There is widespread agreement on the importance of education as a vehicle of ideological change (Fine and Weis, 2003; Apple, 1995; Greene, 1995; Freire, 1970; Dewey, 1931). Apple (1995) asserts that schools, as a critical “arm of the state” (p.48) produce as well as distribute knowledge, belief and norms. He states, “reproduction is only secured after considerable ideological work and is thus susceptible to educational work of an oppositional or counter-hegemonic kind” (p.158) and that “[schools] can provide a significant terrain over which serious action can evolve” (p.10). Further, “how we act on the world...is in part determined by the way we perceive it” (p.63), therefore, if students have a changed understanding of the world, they may be positioned to act on it differently. According to Freeden (2003), post-Marxist thought embraces the idea of ideology as a means of sustaining collective power, in consideration of new constructions of the identity of the individual and a redefining of society.

7.10.1 Collective Action

Phases One and Two of the project addressed the idea of collective action as a strategy for change, past and present, and students in both components reflected their understanding of its potential. In Phase One, students enacted the coal miners' strike in Colorado which resulted in the Ludlow Massacre, more contemporary labor actions from 1965 and 1987 that succeeded, and the possible connections of those dynamics to the current situation of immigrant workers in their community. In the post-project survey, the prompt, "Name anything new you understand about power after this project," generated a range of answers about the possibilities and limitations of collective action. These are transcribed as written.

7.37 Luis: Power is either earned or given you can make changes with power and the power that you have affect others around you

Silvia: Something new I now know about power is it hasn't been fair for years who gets the power. In this survey it asks if money is an important tool for power and I disagree I think is Education honestly. But these days it is possible to have power if you are a minority you just have to stick to your goals.

A'lisa: That anyone, well almost anyone can do anything they want to if they believe in themselves and have good effer [effort] and not give up on themselves.

In Phase Two, the students were introduced to images of contemporary strikes by immigrants, only one of which succeeded. However, the emotional connection the students felt to the protesters in the photographs, most of whom were protesting for rights for undocumented immigrants, was palpable, and even the most reluctant actors in the group were fully engaged, physically and emotionally. In discussion, students reflected on the motivation that caused people who risked deportation to take such a public stand.

7.38 Julio: “You’re making a point. If you’re taking a risk, other people might come and join. You can only go so far with a small group of people.”

Lemmy: “If they don’t do it, who else will? If that person says I want to stand up for my country, everyone around them can do it. It’s a matter of support, that’s all that matters.”

The relatively limited focus on collective action that informed the playmaking had a pronounced effect on the students, who were thoughtful and eloquent in their response to the question, ‘Why do you think people protest/picket/do collective action?’

7.39 Siulmary: “Because they want their voice to be heard. You don’t want--- they want to make a change, they don’t want to leave things the way they are... I’ve learned that when you work together you can accomplish something...Like, if everybody comes together, they can do a lot, make a change.”

- 7.40 Katzia: “Um, divided we fall, together we stand. I mean really it, like, may be corny, it may be a corny saying, but honestly, the more people you have working with you the better you may get your point across. I mean, it takes an army to actually be heard.”
- 7.41 Brian: “To speak their minds. Honestly...they want their point of view out there. They want the right for what they’re fighting for. I mean...in this experience you have to, you have to work together. You start off small and sooner or later people will hear you out and be like, I have the same problem as you...so let me fight for the same reason.”

7.11 Schools, Social Reproduction and Production

Louis Althusser (1993) suggests that ideology is both something that happens *in* us and *to* us, and Foucault asserts that power is always in and around classrooms (Foucault, 1977). Schools are prime sites for communicating the ideologies of society, through the implicit messages of space and structure and the explicit messages of pedagogy, curriculum, and discourse, the communicative practice through which ideology is exercised and mediated in schools and in society. Apple (1995) contends that, “the educational and cultural system is an exceptionally important element in the maintenance of existing relations of domination and exploitation in...societies” (p.9), and points to the “intricate interconnections among schools, economy and culture” (p.105). Further, students of color are often denied access to power in schools, and lack a sense of agency in settings when they “have little power over their learning, when learning has little

relevance to their lives and aspirations, or when they are devalued or marginalized” (McInerney, 2009, p.24).

Many theorists and practitioners agree that the dialogic nature of learning is a crucial factor in the transformation of our current hegemonic ideology (Freedden, 2003; Apple, 1995; Greene, 1995; Taylor, 1992; Freire, 1970). According to Freire, an “educational relationship must be based on dialogue among subjects” (Coutinho and Nogueira, 2009, p.173), and “their active presence in the investigation is more important than the collection of data” (Freire, 1977, p.122). Greene (1995), in discussing the social imagination as “the capacity to invent visions of what should be and what might be in our deficient society,” (p.5) identifies the importance of dialogue between people as a starting point for change.

According to Singer (1980), “For Marx, the unity of theory and practice meant the resolution of theoretical problems by practical activity” (p.43). Marx’s emphasis on practical activity as a means of resolving theoretical problems speaks to my own interest in using AT/D to facilitate students’ understandings of the ideologies that govern their lives and opportunities. If one accepts the construction of ideology as a mutable jigsaw of ideas mediated through image and language, thought and feeling, seeking political and social power, then the potential for change is inherent in the system, and AT/D, with its focus on social and political explorations through verbal, physical, and visual media, has potential as a vehicle for transformation, particularly as it simultaneously generates a sense of community among its participants.

7.11.1 Applied Theatre and Drama

The fact that drama is an effective way to build community is nearly a truism in the field, and, in previous research on the effects of drama on classroom community, there is compelling evidence that drama structures facilitate a sense of collaboration between teachers and students, and within the peer group (Gallagher, 2007; Manley and O'Neill, 1997; Neelands, 1990). "The dramatic arts have a unique capacity to create an experience of community. The collaborative processes of the drama classroom can provide a powerful opportunity to enhance young people's need for belonging and purpose" (Cahill, 2002, p.21).

In particular, forms of Applied Theatre and Drama (AT/D), characterized as "the relationship between theatre practice, social efficacy, and community building" (Nicholson, 2005, p.2), facilitate the development of community among participants (Gallagher, 2007; Cahill, 2002; Nelson, Colby & McIlrath, 2001; Wagner, 1998; Manley and O'Neill, 1997; Neelands, 1990). Taylor (2003) conceives AT/D as "a medium for action, for reflection, but most important, for transformation- a theatre in which new modes of being can be encountered and new possibilities for humankind can be imagined" (p.xxx).

The nature of the transformation offered by AT/D extends beyond the personal to the social and political, where deeply rooted ideologies affect language, thought, and socio-political action. Prentki (2009) states,

The possibilities of transformation are therefore understood as a material, cultural and social vision for change. The concept of transformation can be understood as multi-valent, operating at the political, the geographical, and the individual level; transforming the public sphere of material circumstances, the pedagogical environment and the personal mindset (p.304).

Advocates of this approach “have regarded its participatory dialogue and dialectic qualities as effective and democratic ways of learning” (Nicholson, 2005, p.38) which, “responsive to ordinary people and their stories, local settings and priorities” (Prentki and Preston, 2009, p.9), incorporate the cultural and social orientation of participants.

Giroux (1992) supports the importance of addressing culture as a factor in ideological change, expanding opportunities for reflection, exchange, and identity work among an array of dominant and subaltern groups and reinforcing the importance of linking praxis to struggles over real material conditions that effect everyday life. According to Appadurai (2004), “it is in culture that ideas of the future, as much as those about the past are embedded and nurtured” (p.59), and he identifies AT/D as a vehicle for allowing people to practice and increase their capacity to aspire beyond existing norms of domination by experimenting with the hypothetical.

On a cautionary note, Prentki (2009) suggests that AT/D offers the potential to allow people to explore radical ideas and the need for change, but advises that it can also become a “safe space” (p.364) that domesticates, gently supporting the status quo and teaching people to adapt to existing realities. In spite of his reservations, Prentki (2009) asserts that:

[E]vidence is all around us that applied theatre is needed now more than ever before. It is needed because it can enable hitherto passive members of groups to transform themselves into active citizens; needed because it is by definition a collective activity in a world where the mass of people lead lives of increasing isolation and fragmentation (p.364).

Bauman (2001) claims that “power consists in decision-making and resides with those who make the decisions” (p.40). An understanding of the ways in which ideologies are constructed and by whom, and an exploration of current

political and social messages and their implementation in schools as forces of hegemonic reproduction, positions us to consider courses of action designed to interrupt existing inequitable belief systems. Apple (1995) points to the importance of “collective mobilizations” (p.11) and constant labor to make subaltern voices heard, and suggests that “subaltern groups resist the role of spectator, and instead act to challenge current economic structures” (p.29).

The use of applied theatre/drama strategies, specifically directed at generating student awareness of embedded and concretized ideas, with the goal of creating an environment conducive to oppositional and counter-hegemonic constructions of reality, is one such alternative. Finally, consideration of the role of community, and the complex interaction of community and power for urban students of color, indicates a possible focus for the applied theatre/drama experiences.

7.12 Necessary Change

It is easy to identify some of the methodological changes I’d address in repeating this study: extend the Preliminary Study to provide a wider sample of data, either by conducting the same class with several groups (source triangulation) or working more extensively with one class; provide additional outside ethnography in every phase of the project; conduct post-project interviews as part of Phase One data collection; and get written and verbal feedback from students in each component of the study to vet initial findings. Other elements, such as my leadership of the playmaking development in Phase Two, or my relationship with Amy (which complicated her direction of the show), are problematic, though I don’t see a clear alternative to the choices I made. In

analyzing the data, I would invite more feedback from the students later in the process for additional source and methodological triangulation. The most substantial change I'd make, however, is to the curriculum of Phase One.

Apple (1995, 2006) argues for the importance of a curriculum that teaches the history of workers' struggles and visions: "the history of what people strived for, of the visions of a more equitable society, and of the demands for and struggles over them, all of this needs to be made visible and legitimate once again" (p.157). In support of introducing to students a politicized curriculum incorporating collective action, unionization, and workers' rights, he states,

Their own current conditions remain relatively unanalyzed, in part because the ideological perspectives they are offered (and the critical tools not made available) defuse both the political and economic history and the conceptual apparatus required for a thorough appraisal of their position. The possibility of concerted action is forgotten (p.117).

I think this is true, though I find Apple's emphasis on the potential efficacy of reintroducing curriculum about labor history overstated. However, I agree that it is a necessary step in mitigating existing dynamics, particularly if the school environment can be altered to become a "contested discursive space within which potentially more socially democratic articulations and educational visions might be formed" (Apple, 2006, p.113). Further, I think that offering students access to new language (collective action, power asymmetry, etc.) in an environment in which they have membership in a changed dialogue has the chance to change their orientation to inequity and oppression.

The process drama work of Phase One utilized curriculum on labor dynamics and collective action as a vehicle for introducing the idea of unequal power dynamics, first through the Colorado coal strike of 1914 that culminated in the Ludlow Massacre, then through more contemporary (and successful) strikes in

1965 and 1987, and finally through exploring labor conditions that affected the lives of the students and their parents. In the course of the project, students were introduced to new language (collective action, worker resistance) and to an expanded exploration of familiar words (union, strike). They depicted and discussed the unequal power dynamics that drive current labor practice and both explicitly and implicitly recognized the effect of those dynamics on immigrants and the poor. I can point to the ways that this experience answered, to some degree, the question of the effect of process drama structures on students' understanding of hegemony and unequal power dynamics. It positively affected their understandings.

7.12.1 Student Voice, Reconsidered

However, I'd argue that in terms of student "voice," Phase One was the least effective component of the project. While students shared their ideas and insights, created a range of powerful images, scenes, and movement pieces depicting unequal power dynamics, and drew insightful conclusions at the end of the project, there was no moment in which it felt as though they had taken ownership of the process and the material, as was apparent in small ways in the Preliminary Study and in substantial ways in playmaking. In terms of learning outcomes, it was fine, but I feel that Phase One primarily demonstrated that I can design an effective drama lesson that, in the hands of a skilled teacher, can engage students and get them where I want them to go. This stands in contrast to the playmaking experience in Phase Two, in which students took control of the direction of the play and experienced voice, agency, and increased community as a class (by their own reports), as a result.

Freire (1972) states that,

In cultural invasion, the actors draw the thematic control of their action from their own values and ideology; their starting point is their own world, from which they enter the world of those they invade. In cultural synthesis, the actors who came from 'another world' to the world of the people do so not as invaders. They do not come to teach or to transmit or to give anything, but rather to learn, with the people, about the peoples' world" (p.161).

While I'd hesitate to identify this phase of the project as cultural invasion, I would also acknowledge that it fell short of achieving cultural synthesis.

Boal (1979) states that "the theatre is a weapon, and it is the people who should wield it," (p.121) and that "the theatre can be placed at the service of the oppressed, so that they can express themselves and so that, by using this new language, they can also discover new concepts" (p.121). In practical terms, I think the process drama component could have been more effective, both for placing the 'weapon' in the hands of the students and in helping them discover 'new concepts,' with the following changes:

- 1) a focus on more recent successful labor actions- 1965, even 1987, is the distant past for high school students, and exploring a problem that hasn't changed in systematic ways since 1914, in spite of sacrifices made by labor activists and workers, is defeating for them;
- 2) physical and scene-based explorations of the moments of success in the various work actions; and
- 3) offering students leadership of the form when considering the dynamics that inform their lives as immigrants in Chelsea- perhaps taking a page from playmaking and asking them to share stories with each other of overcoming oppression in their work lives.

7.13 Finding Meaning

I've discussed the outcomes of the project at great length in this document, and have considered shared components earlier in this chapter. To sum up: in the course of this project, I achieved a limited, preliminary understanding of how the students who participated conceptualize and identify power, and a variety of ways in which power is enacted in their lives. I can draw cautious-but-reasonably-documented conclusions regarding the effectiveness of process drama and playmaking on facilitating students' understandings of unequal power dynamics and cultural hegemony as factors in the lives of immigrants and the urban poor, and can point to ways in which teaching labor history from the past informed students' understanding of contemporary labor issues and collective action in the present.

Of greater interest to me is the indication that applied theatre/drama strategies, particularly the playmaking experience of Phase Two, may have potential for facilitating students' development of identity as change agents, and the eventual development of advocacy skills (though it seems clear that a precondition of the development of those skills is the students' belief that others care what they have to say).

Of greatest interest to me, and, I believe, the potential addition my research makes to the canon of understanding, is in the exploration of community and power as conflated dynamics in the lives of many students of color. The integration of community and power is present in each phase of the project, and classroom community seemed to be central to the function of the students in each class, which may indicate a direction for subsequent uses of AT/D with urban students.

7.13.1 Pushing the Envelope

Gramsci believed that “all men [and women] are intellectuals” and consciousness might be a space where an emancipatory consciousness could be forged (Hoare and Nowell Smith, 1971, p. 9). If consciousness is a more communal space for urban students of color, as reflected in the sense of community, belonging, and communal power orientation that they exhibited in the drama classes, then AT/D, in which community is intricately involved, could be an ideal vehicle for forging an emancipatory consciousness, as we “seek out those concerns that resonate with oppressed communities, and to use these as starting points for building more progressive alternatives” (Apple and Buras, 2006, p.273).

Habermas proposed a 4 stage model for creating an emancipatory praxis: 1) achieving a “big picture” understanding through describing and interpreting an existing situation; 2) interrogating the reasons behind the existence of the situation; 3) altering or democratizing the existing situation through a proposed action; and 4) evaluating the effectiveness of the actions in transforming the existing situation (Carr and Kemmis, 1986). AT/D can be utilized as an emancipatory praxis as we ask communities of students to identify concerns that resonate with them, then use AT/D’s “participatory dialogue and dialectic qualities as effective and democratic ways of learning” (Nicholson, 2005, p.38) using “the narratives of the participants and the specific social locations and cultural contexts in which the work takes place” (ibid, p.50).

In the playmaking experience, and to a limited extent in the scene work in the Preliminary Study, students shared moments of personal power that they’d experienced in their lives. Students stated in interview that hearing others’ stories made them realize their power both as individuals and as a group. How do we

build on that? Freeden (2003) states that “the evidence for our (political) thinking (ideology) lies in our actions and utterances” (p.21) and that “political thought can be unpacked through empirically observable acts” (p.23). Conversely, can ideology be changed through the opportunity to experiment with different ‘actions and utterances’? If AT/D is utilized as emancipatory praxis to help students understand the “big picture” of hegemonic dynamics that constrain their lives, explore the underlying ideological and political roots of the situation, and practice alternative responses, can they begin to reconceptualize their role in those ideologies and develop an emancipatory consciousness?

7.14 Future Options

As the body of literature on AT/D continues to grow, there are opportunities for literature-based research that further explores and elucidates the connections between community and power as demonstrated in AT/D projects. There are also connections to be considered with wider school-based initiatives, such as those evolving from the Small Schools movement of the 1980s (Benitez, Davidson, and Flaxman, 2009; Klonsky and Klonsky, 2008; Meier, 2002), which focus on the critical role of community in learning and student outcomes. In the Small Schools movement, for example,

the idea was not just to make schools smaller but to capture two essentials for successful learning: 1) the visibility of children and 2) the professional community of teachers. The first meant that school environments and practices would facilitate closer, stronger relationships between kids and adults; that every student would be known by a community of caring, nurturing adults; that students would be active participants and not just receptacles in the creation of knowledge; and that anonymity was enemy number one (Klonsky and Klonsky, 2008, p.16).

This philosophy is also central to schools in the Coalition of Essential Schools network, as well as some of the charter and pilot schools in the U.S. (Sizer, 2004;

Muncey and McQuillan, 1996). (In an interesting development, Chelsea High School is adopting a school-wide community-building initiative in order to address high rates of school failure and dropping out. All incoming first year students are in 15-student advising groups that meet daily and will remain as consistent as possible across the 4 years of high school. Teachers are receiving intensive professional development in community-building, and the curriculum is being reorganized into cluster-based programming in a Small Schools model to build community among teachers and between teachers and students.)

In the short term, replication of the playmaking phase of the project is planned for the fall semester of 2011 at Chelsea High School with an emphasis on understanding the interaction of community and power in student outcomes. I am also pursuing funding to replicate this phase in three other urban high schools in the Greater Boston area in Massachusetts during 2012-13. Longer term extensions include the possibility of a quantitative study of student pass rates and graduation outcomes as Chelsea pursues its community-centered initiative for school change, and replication of the revised process drama component of Phase One focused on the interaction of community and power and the connection between personal and collective agency.

7.15 Conclusion

No one is free, until we are all free (Habermas, 2002, p.161).

We don't have to be ashamed of Chelsea. We can be proud of it. We can be proud of ourselves. Michael, Grade 12, Phase Two

Bourdieu (1993) contends that “the dominated are the least capable of controlling their own representation” (p.50) and “they are spoken of more than they speak” (p.51). Applied Theatre/Drama offers students the opportunity to represent themselves in drama and theatre, in both process and product oriented experiences centered around the establishment of communities of influence (Greene, 1995; Foucault, 1977; Arendt, 1958) and the exploration of cultural hegemony in public spaces (Foucault, 1977; Arendt, 1958) which encourage critical discourse and the re-imagining of the social good (Neelands, 2007; Apple and Buras, 2006; Gramsci, in Apple and Buras, 2006; Nicholson, 2005). If we accept, as Freedman (2003) contends, that ideologies are not large, unified monoliths but a jigsaw of components, often communicated in visual or pictorial forms, that “can be recast as engines of change and renewal, not just as unbending instruments of dominance” (p.44) and Marx’s (in Singer, 1980) assertion that the resolution of theoretical problems lies in practical activity, then the practical activity of applied drama and theatre, with its visual orientation and creation of a public space in which to engage in critical and counter-hegemonic discourse in a situated community of power offers a fruitful opportunity for fostering students’ understandings of unequal power dynamics and envisioning the possibility of change.

I’m not saying we’re going to succeed in this; we don’t even know whether success is possible. But because we don’t know, we still have to try (Habermas, 1994, p.97).

Bibliography

- Ackroyd, J. (2000). 'Applied theatre: problems and possibilities', *Applied Theatre Journal*, 1: <http://www.gu.edu.au/centre/atr/> accessed April 16 2004.
- Ackroyd, J., ed. (2006). *Research methodologies for drama education*. Staffordshire: Trentham Books Limited.
- Adelson, J. & O'Neil, R.P. (1966). Growth of political ideas in adolescence: the sense of community. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 4(3), pp.295-306.
- Allen, G. (2006). The arts and the cult of performance. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 5(3), 291-304.
- Althusser, L. (1993). *Essays on ideology*. New York: Verso.
- Appadurai, A. (2004). The capacity to aspire: Culture and the terms of recognition. In: Rao, V. and Walton, M., eds. *Culture and public action*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, p.59.
- Apple, M. (1995). *Education and power*. 2nd edition. New York: Routledge.
- Apple, M. & Buras, K., eds. (2006). *The subaltern speak*. New York: Routledge.
- Arendt, H. (1958, 1998). *The human condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Arendt, H. (1961). *Between past and future*. New York: Viking Penguin.
- Bacon, J. (2006). The feeling of the experience: A methodology for performance ethnography. In: Ackroyd, J., ed. *Research methodologies for drama education*. Staffordshire: Trentham Books Limited, pp.135-158.
- Banks, J. (2005). *Cultural diversity and education: Foundations, curriculum, and teaching*. 5th Edition. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bauman, Z. (2001). *Community: Seeking safety in an insecure world*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bauman, Z. (2008). *The art of life*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Beer, D.W. (1997). "There's a certain slant of light": the experience of discovery in qualitative interviewing. *Occupational Therapy Journal of Research*, 17, pp.110-129.
- Benitez, M., Davidson, J., & Flaxman, L. (2009). *Small schools, big ideas: The essential guide to school transformation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Bernal, D.D. (2006). Rethinking grassroots activism: Chicana resistance in the 1968 East Los Angeles school blowouts. In: Apple, M. & Buras, K., eds. *The subaltern speak*. New York: Routledge, pp.141-162.
- Bigelow, B. (2001). *Rethinking our classrooms: Teaching for equity and justice*. Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking School, LTD.
- Bigelow, B. & Peterson, B. (2002). *Rethinking globalization: Teaching for justice in an unjust world*. Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking School, LTD.
- Boal, A. (1979. 2000). *Theatre of the oppressed*. C. and M.-O. Leal McBride, trans. London: Pluto Press and TCG.
- Boal, A. (2002). *Games for actors and non-actors*. New York: Routledge.
- Bochner, A. (2002). Criteria against ourselves. In: Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S., eds. *The qualitative inquiry reader*. London: Sage, pp. 257-267.
- Bourdieu, P. et al (1993). *The weight of the world*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1996). *Understanding. Theory, Culture and Society*, **13**(2), pp.17- 37.
- Bradburn, N.M., Sudman, S. & Wansink, B. (2004). *Asking questions: The definitive guide to questionnaire design- For market research, political polls, and social and health questionnaires*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Bragg, S. (2007). *Consulting young people: a review of the literature. A report for Creative Partnerships*. London: Arts Council England.
- Brenner, M.E. (2006). Interviewing in educational research. In: Green, J., Camilli, G., & Elmore, P., eds. *Handbook of complementary methods in education research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., pp. 357-370.
- Britzman, D. (1991). *Practice makes practice*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Bundy, P. (2009). The performance of trauma. In: Prentki, T. and Preston, S., eds. *The applied theatre reader*. New York: Routledge, pp.233-240.
- Cahill, H. (2002). Teaching for community: empowerment through drama. *Melbourne Studies in Education*, **43**(2), pp.12-25.
- Carr, W. & Kemmis, S. (1986). *Becoming critical*. London: Routledge Falmer.

- Casley, D.J. and Kumar, K. (1988). *The collection, analysis and use of monitoring and evaluation data*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press for the World Bank.
- Casley, D.J. and Lury, D.A. (1982). *Data collection in developing countries*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Castoriadis, C. (1997). Done and to be done. D. A. Curtis, trans. *In: Castoriadis reader*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 361-417.
- Chen, S., Lee-Chai, A. Y., & Bargh, J. A. (2001). Relationship orientation as a moderator of the effects of social power [Electronic version]. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **80**, pp.173–187.
- City Data. [Online]. <http://www.city-data.com/city/Chelsea-Massachusetts.html>. (Accessed July 29, 2011).
- Coffey, A. & Atkinson, P. (1996). *Making sense of qualitative data*. London: Sage.
- Cohen, L. & Manion, L. (1980). *Research methods in education*. London: Croom Helm.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morriison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education*. New York: Routledge.
- Cotterill, P. (1992). Interviewing women: issues of friendship, vulnerability, and power. *Women's Studies International Forum*, **15**, pp.593-606.
- Coutinho, M. & Nogueira, M.P. (2009). The use of dialogical approaches for community theatre by the group Nós Do Morro, in the Vidigal Favela of Rio de Janeiro. D. Herman, trans. *In* Prentki, T. & Preston, S., eds. *The applied theatre reader*. (2009). New York: Routledge, pp. 170-177.
- Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: meaning and perspective in the research process*. London: Sage.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). *The flat world and education: How America's commitment to equity will determine our future*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Dei, G. (2003). Schooling and the dilemma of youth engagement. *McGill Journal of Education* **38**(2), 241–256.
- Dench, G. (1986). *Minorities in the open society: Prisoners of ambivalence*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- D'Entrevres, M. P. (1992). Hannah Arendt and the idea of citizenship. *In*: Mouffe, C., ed. *Dimensions of radical democracy*. London: Verso, pp.145-168.

- Denzin, N. K. (1997). Coffee with Anselm. *Qualitative Family Research*, 11 (1,2 November) 16-18.
- DeVault, M.L. (1997). Personal writing in social science: Issues of production and implementation. In: Hertz, R., ed. *Reflexivity and voice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 216-229.
- Dewey, J. (1931). *Philosophy and civilization*. New York: Minton, Balch.
- Donoghue, D. (1983). *The arts without mystery*. Boston: Little Brown.
- Edwards, R. (1990). Connecting method and epistemology: A White woman interviewing Black women. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 13, pp.477-90.
- Etzioni, A. (1968). *The active society*. London: Collier Macmillan.
- Etzioni, A. (1997). *The new golden rule: Community and morality in a democratic society*. New York: Basic Books.
- Evans, S.D. (2007). Youth sense of community: voice and power in community contexts. [Electronic version]. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 35(6), pp.693-709. Retrieved December 27, 2007 from the in Wiley InterScience database.
- Executive Office of Labor and Workforce Development of Massachusetts. [Online]. www.mass.gov > [Home](#) > [Government](#) > [EOLWD Data and Statistics](#). (Accessed July 28, 2011).
- Fine, M., Anand, B., Jordan, C., & Sherman, D. (2000). Before the bleach gets us all. In: Weis, L., & Fine, M., eds. *Construction sites*. New York: Teachers College Press, pp. 161-179.
- Fine, M., & Weis, L. (2003). *Silenced voices and extraordinary conversations... Re-imagining schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Finlay, L. (2002). "Outing" the researcher: the provenance, process, and practice of reflexivity. *Qualitative Health Research*, April 12, pp.531-545.
- Finlayson, J.G. (2005). *Habermas: A very short introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fordham, S. & Ogbu, J. (1986). Black students school success: Coping with the burden of 'acting white'. *The Urban Review*, 18(3), pp.176-206.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York: Pantheon.

- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977*. Gordon, C., ed. New York: Vintage.
- Foucault, M. (1984). Polemics, politics and problemizations: An interview. L. Davis, trans. In: Rabinow, P., ed. *The Foucault reader*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Fraser, N. & Honneth, A. (2003). *Redistribution or recognition: A political-philosophical exchange*. London: Verso.
- Freedden, M. (2003). *Ideology: A very short introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Freire, P. (1970a). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. M.B. Ramos, trans. New York: Herder & Herder.
- Freire, P. (1970b). *Cultural action for freedom*. Cambridge: Harvard Educational Review.
- Freire, P. (1970c). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. M. Ranos, trans. London: Penguin Books and Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Freire, P. (1977). *Pedagogio de oprimido*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.
- Freire, P. (1985). *The politics of education: Culture, power and liberation*. New York: Seabury Press.
- Freire, P. & Macedo, D. (1987). *Literacy: Reading the word and the world*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey.
- Freire, P. (1993). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. London: Penguin Books.
- Freire, P. & Macedo, D. (1995). A dialogue: culture, language, and race. *Harvard Educational Review*, **65**(3), p. 379.
- Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of freedom*. London: Bowmann and Littlefield.
- Freire, P. (2008). *Education for critical consciousness*. London: Continuum Books.
- Galinsky, A.D., Gruenfeld, D. H., & Magee, J.C. (2003). From power to action [Electronic version]. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **85**(3), pp.453-466.
- Gallagher, K. (2006). (Post) critical ethnography in drama research. In: Ackroyd, J., ed. *Research methodologies for drama education*. Staffordshire: Trentham Books Limited, pp. 63-80.

- Gallagher, K. (2007). *The theatre of urban: Youth and schooling in dangerous times*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Gandin, L. A. (2006). Creating real alternatives to neoliberal policies in education: The Citizen School project. In: Apple, M. & Buras, K., eds. *The subaltern speak*. New York: Routledge, pp.217-242.
- Geertz, C. (1980). Blurred genres: the refiguration of social thought. *The American Scholar*, **49**, pp.165-182.
- Gintis, H. (1980). Communication and politics: Marxism and the 'problem' of liberal democracy. *Socialist Review X*, (March-June), p.191.
- Giroux, H. (1992). *Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education*. New York: Routledge.
- Giroux, H. (1995). Insurgent multiculturalism and the promise of pedagogy. In: Goldberg, D. T., ed. *Multiculturalism: A critical reader*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell, pp. 325-343.
- Giroux, H. (2011). In the twilight of the social state: Rethinking Walter Benjamin's Angel of History [Electronic version]. *Truthout*, <http://www.truth-out.org/in-twilight-social-state-rethinking-walter-benjamins-angel-history66544> Retrieved January 4, 2011 from online journal.
- Glaser, B.G. & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. New York: Aldine.
- Goodlad, J.I. (1984). *A place called school*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Grady, S. (2006). Feminist methodology: Researching as if gender and social power really mattered. In: Ackroyd, J., ed. *Research methodologies for drama education*. Staffordshire: Trentham Books Limited, pp.81-110.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks*. Hoare, Q. and Nowell, G. eds. New York: International Publishing.
- Gramsci, A. (2009). Selections from the prison notebooks. In: Prentki, T. & Preston, S., eds. *The applied theatre reader*. (2009) New York: Routledge, pp. 138-140.
- Gramsci, A. (2010). *The prison notebooks*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Green, J., Camilli, G., & Elmore, P., eds. (2006). *Handbook of complementary methods in education research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

- Greene, M. (1995). *Releasing the imagination: Essays on education, the arts, and social change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Guba, E. G. and Lincoln, Y. S. (1990). Can there be a human science? *Person-Centered Review*, 5 (2), 130-54.
- Guba, E. G. and Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Gutting, G. (2005). *Foucault: A very short introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Habermas, J. (1979). *Communication and the evolution of society*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Habermas, J. (1991). *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Habermas, J. (1994). *The past as future: Jurgen Habermas interviewed by Michael Haller*. Max Pensky, trans. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Habermas, J. (2002). *Religion and rationality: Essays on reason, God, and modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Haraway, D. (1988). Situated knowledges: the science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist Studies* 14, pp.575-99.
- Havel, V. (1983). *Letters to Olga*. P. Wilson, trans. New York: Holt.
- Heathcote, D. (1997, 2008). Drama as a process for change. In: Prentki, T. & Preston, S., eds. *The applied theatre reader*. (2009) New York: Routledge, pp. 170-177.
- Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and time*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Hertz, R. ed. (1997). *Reflexivity and voice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hoare, Q. & Smith, N.S. eds. (1971, 2005). *Antonio Gramsci, Selections from the prison notebooks*. pp. 9-13. Lawrence and Wishart. In: Prentki, T. & Preston, S., eds. *The applied theatre reader*. (2009) New York: Routledge, pp. 138-140.
- Jackson, S. A. W. (1997). Everybody's history. In: Manley, A. & O'Neill, C., eds. *Dreamseekers. Creative approaches to the African American heritage*. Portsmouth: Heinemann, pp. 23-34.
- Jorgenson, J. (1991). Co-constructing the interviewer/co-constructing "family". In: Steier, F., ed. *Research and reflexivity*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, pp. 210-225.

- Keltner, D., Gruenfeld, D. H., & Anderson, C. (2003). Power, approach, and inhibition [Electronic version]. *Psychological Review*, **110**, pp.265–284.
- Kershaw, B. (1992) *The politics of performance: Radical theatre as cultural intervention*. New York: Routledge.
- Kinchloe, J. (1991). *Teachers as researchers*. London: Falmer.
- Kinchloe, J. & McLaren, P. (2000). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In: Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. eds. *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage, pp.279-314.
- Klonsky, M. & Klonsky, S. (2008) *Small schools: Public school reform meets the ownership society*. New York: Routledge.
- Kohn, A. (2011). *Feel bad education and other contrarian essays on children and schooling*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Kozol, J. (1991). *Savage inequalities*. New York: Crown.
- Kvale, S. (2002). The social construction of validity. In: Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S., eds. *The qualitative inquiry reader*. London: Sage, pp. 299-325.
- LaClau, E. & Mouffe, C. (1985). *Hegemony and social strategy*. London: Verso.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1994, 2009). *The dreamkeepers Successful teachers of African American children*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- LeCompte, M. D. & Preissle, J. (1993). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research*. 2nd ed. San Diego: Academic Press, as cited in: *Qualitative research design*. 2nd ed. by J. Maxwell (2005). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, p.100-101.
- Lee, E. (1995). Taking multicultural, anti-racist education seriously: An interview with Enid Lee. In: Levine, D., Lowe, R., Peterson, B., & Tenorio, R. eds. *Rethinking schools. An agenda for change*. New York: The New Press, pp.9-16.
- Lincoln, Y.S. & Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Macedo, D.& Bartolomé, L.I. (1999). *Dancing with bigotry. Beyond the politics of tolerance*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Manley, A. & O'Neill, C. (1997). *Dreamseekers. Creative approaches to the African American heritage*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.

- Marsland, N., Wilson, I., Abeyasekera S., & Kleih U. (n.d.). *A Methodological Framework for Integrating Qualitative and Quantitative Survey Methods*. Natural Resources Systems Programme, project R7033. University of Reading.
- Martin, J. (2004). *Freire versus Marx: the tensions between liberating pedagogy and student alienation*, Paper presented at the Annual Conference Workshop of the Social Theory Forum, Boston.
- Martinez, G. (2006) In my history classes they always turn things around the opposite way: Indigenous youth opposition to cultural domination in an urban high school. In: Apple, M. & Buras, K. eds., *The subaltern speak*. New York: Routledge, pp. 121-140.
- Marx, K. & Engels, F. (1998). *The German Ideology, including theses on Feuerbach*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Mason, J. (1996). *Qualitative researching*. London: Sage.
- Mauthner, N. S. & Doucet, A. (2003). Reflexive accounts and accounts of reflexivity in qualitative data analysis. *Sociology*, **37**, pp.413-431.
- McDonnell, B. (2005). Towards a theatre of “little changes:” a dialogue about dialogue. *Research in Drama Education: the journal of applied theatre*, **10**(1), pp.67-73.
- McInerney, P. (2009). Toward a critical pedagogy of engagement for alienated youth: insights from Freire and school-based research. *Critical Studies in Education*, **50**(1), pp.23-35.
- McLellan, D. (1977). *Karl Marx: Selected writings*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McMillan, D.W., & Chavis, D.M. (1986). Sense of community: A definition and theory [Electronic version]. *Journal of Community Psychology*, **14**(1), pp.6–23.
- McNeil, L. (2000). *Contradictions of school reform: Educational costs of standardized testing*. New York: Routledge.
- Meier, D. (2002). *The power of their ideas: Lessons for America from a small school in Harlem*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Mocclair, P. (2009). Altogether now? Reconsidering the merits of participation in child’s rights theatre. In: Prentki, T. & Preston, S., eds. *The applied theatre reader*, (2009). New York: Routledge, pp. 155-162.
- Mouffe, C., ed. (1992). *Dimensions of radical democracy: Pluralism, citizenship, community*. London: Verso.

- Mouffe, C. (2006). On the political. In: Prentki, T. & Preston, S., eds. *The applied theatre reader*, (2009). New York: Routledge, pp. 77-79.
- Muncey, D.E. & McQuillan, P. J. (1996). *Reform & resistance in schools and classrooms: An ethnographic view of the coalition of essential schools*. London: Yale University Press.
- Neelands, J. (1984). *Making sense of drama: A guide to classroom practice*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Neelands, J. (1990). *Structuring drama work: A handbook of available forms in theatre and drama*. Tony Goode, ed. Cambridge University Press.
- Neelands, J. (2006). Re-imagining the reflective practitioner: Towards a philosophy of critical praxis. In: Ackroyd, J., ed. *Research methodologies for drama education*. Staffordshire: Trentham Books Limited, pp. 15-40.
- Neelands, J. (2007). Taming the political; the struggle over recognition in the politics of applied theatre. *RiDE: Research in Drama Education*, **12**(3), pp.305-317.
- Neimeyer, G. J., (ed.) (1993). *Constructivist assessment: A casebook*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Nelson, B., Colby, R., & McIlrath, M. (2001). "Having their say": the effects of using role with an urban middle school class. *Youth Theatre Journal*, **15**, pp.59-69.
- Nelson, B. (2005). Opening doors: drama as culturally relevant pedagogy. *Drama Australia Journal*, **29**, pp.51-62.
- Nelson, B. (2009). Beyond belonging: the relationship between community and power for urban students of color. *Drama Research: International Journal of Drama in Education*, **1**, pp.60-74.
- Nelson, B. (2010). Power and community in drama. In Schonmann, S., ed. *Key concepts in theatre/drama education*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, pp.81-86.
- Nelson, B. (2011). "I made myself: playmaking as a pedagogy of change with urban youth." *Research in Drama Education Journal: the journal of applied theatre*, **16**, no. 2.
- Nicholson, H. (2005) *Applied drama: the gift of theatre*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nieto, S. (1999). *The light in their eyes. Creating multicultural learning communities*. New York: Teachers College Press.

- Nieto, S. (2002). *Language, culture, and teaching. Critical perspectives for a new century*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Nieto, S. & Bode, P. (2007). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education*. 5th Edition. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Oakley, A. (1981). Interviewing women: A contradiction in terms. In: Roberts, H., ed. *Doing feminist research*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, pp. 30-61.
- O'Neill, C. (1995). *Drama worlds*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- O'Toole, J. (1992). *The process of drama: Negotiating art and meaning*. New York: Routledge.
- Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. 3rd edition. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Pedroni, T. C. (2006). Can the subaltern act? African American involvement in educational voucher plans. In: Apple, M. & Buras, K., eds. *The subaltern speak*. New York: Routledge, pp.121-140.
- Prendergast, M. & Saxton, J., eds. (2009). *Applied theatre: International case studies and challenges for practice*. Chicago: Intellect, The University of Chicago Press.
- Prentki, T. & Preston, S. eds. (2009). *The applied theatre reader*. New York: Routledge.
- Prilleltensky, I., Nelson, G., & Peirson, L. (2001). The role of power and control in children's lives: an ecological analysis of pathways toward wellness, resilience, and problems [Electronic version]. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, **11**, pp.143-158. Retrieved December 27, 2007 from the PsycARTICLES database.
- Rao, V. & Walton, M. (2004). Culture and public action: Relationality, equality of agency, and development. In: Rao, V. and Walton, M., eds. *Culture and public action*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Redfield, R. (1971). *The little community and peasant society and culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Reich, R. B. (1991). *The work of nations: Preparing ourselves for 21st century capitalism*. New York: First Vintage Books.
- Ribbens, J. (1989). Interviewing- an unnatural situation? *Women's Studies International Forum*, **12**(6), pp.579-92.

- San Miguel, G. (2004). *Contested policy: The rise and fall of federal bilingual education in the United States, 1960-2001*. Denton, TX: University of North Texas Press.
- Sarason, S.B. (1986). The emergence of a conceptual center. *Journal of Community Psychology*, **14**(4), pp.405-407.
- Sennett, R. (1998). *The corrosion of character: The personal consequences of work in the new capitalism*. New York: Norton.
- Sennett, R. (2003). *Respect: The formation of character in an age of inequality*. London: Penguin Books.
- Shadish, W.R. (1995). Philosophy of science and the quantitative-qualitative debates: thirteen common errors. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, **18** (1), pp.63-75.
- Shon, D. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Shor, I. (1992). *Empowering education: Critical teaching for social change*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Silverman, D. (2005). *Doing qualitative research: A practical handbook*. 2nd edition. London: Sage.
- Singer, P. (1980). *Marx: A very short introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sizer, T. R. (2004). *Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school*. Wilmington, MA: Mariner Books.
- Social Research Methods* [Online]. <http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/qual.php> . (Accessed September 12, 2008).
- Social Research Methods- Questionnaire Design* [Online]. http://www.cc.gatech.edu/classes/cs6751_97_winter/Topics/quest-design/. (Accessed September 12, 2008).
- Song, M. & Parker, I. (1995). Commonality, difference, and the dynamics of disclosure in in-depth interviewing. *Sociology* **29**, pp.241-56.
- Spivak, G.C. (1996). Subaltern studies: Deconstructing historiography (1985). In: Landry, D. & G. Maclean, G., eds. *The Spivak reader: Selected works of Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak*. New York: Routledge, pp.203-235.
- Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case study research*. London: Sage.
- Stenhouse, L. (1980). The study of samples and the study of cases. In *British Educational Research Journal*, **6** (1).

- Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. 2nd edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tatum, B.D. (1997, 2003). *Why are all the black kids sitting together in the cafeteria? And other conversations about race*. New York: Basic Books.
- Tatum, B.D. (2007). *Can we talk about race? And other conversations in an era of school resegregation*. Boston : Beacon Press.
- Taylor, C. (1992). *Multiculturalism and "the politics of recognition": An essay by Charles Taylor*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Taylor, P. (2000). *The drama classroom: Action, reflection, transformation*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Taylor, P. (2003). *Applied theatre: Creating transformative encounters in the community*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.
- Taylor, P. (2006). Power and privilege: Re-envisioning the qualitative research lens. In: Ackroyd, J., ed. *Research methodologies for drama education*. Staffordshire: Trentham Books Limited, pp.1-14.
- Thomas, W. I. and Thomas, D. (1928). *The child in America*. New York: Knopf.
- Tully, J. (2004) Recognition and dialogue: the emergence of a new field. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 7(3), Autumn 2004, pp.84-106.
- Veblen, T. (2000). *The theory of the leisure class: An economic study of institutions*. New York: Adamant Media Corporation.
- Wagner B.J. (1998). *Educational drama and language arts. What research shows*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.
- Walsh, R. A. (1995). The approach of the human science researcher: implications for the practice of qualitative research. *The Humanist Psychologist*, 23, pp.333-344.
- Warnock, M. (1978). *Imagination*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Wasserfall, R.R. (1997). Reflexivity, feminism, and difference. In: Hertz, R., ed. *Reflexivity and voice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 150-169.
- Weeks, J. (2000). *Making sexual history*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Whitlock, J. (2007). The role of adults, public space, and power in adolescent community connectedness [Electronic version]. *Journal of Community Psychology*, **35**(4), pp.499-518. Retrieved December 27, 2007 from the in Wiley InterScience database.
- Winston, J. (2006). Researching through case study. *In: Ackroyd, J., ed. Research methodologies for drama education*. Staffordshire: Trentham Books Limited, pp. 41-61.
- Wolcott, H. (1990). *Writing up qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Yin, R. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods*. London: Sage.
- Zatzman, B. (2006). Narrative inquiry: Postcards from Northampton. *In: Ackroyd, J., ed. Research methodologies for drama education*. Staffordshire: Trentham Books Limited, pp.111-134.

Appendix

Appendix A

Phase One: Coded Data Sample

Community

Power

Community and power

Anti-community

10/20/08

F Block- Intro class- Amy Teaching

<p>OF- 4 months later, both Joselin and Silvia are pregnant. Joselin was pregnant at the time, though she may not have known it yet. Both have a lot of smarts—very capable, very pretty.</p>	<p>On the left side of the auditorium, the kids sit in their 'usual' seats, closer to the front. On the right side, they sit further back, also in familiar seats. On right, Fernando, Joanne, A'lisa, Joselin, Deedee, Estephania, Karen and Francisco (furthest forward of this group—about 4 rows back). On left, Luis, Armando, Adolfo (furthest back), Stephanie, Tracy, Silvia, Noemi, Mo, Jacky, Erica, Bonnie (3 furthest front- in second row). Carlos, Jeffrey, and Lawson absent.</p> <p>Amy asks for consent forms. Karen has hers. Amy: "You win!" Armando and Mo fill theirs out on the spot (they're over 18). Bonnie says she got hers signed but can't find it. Jokes about signing it herself (she's not 18).</p> <p>Morning announcements—hard to hear. They're shown on TV in all other rooms. The Drama Club won the Club Expo competition. Amy showed me a Thank You note from the Principal, recognizing her efforts in setting it up.</p> <p>She chats with the kids- How was your weekend? Comments on Jacky's jacket, asks how she got it (it's from a produce company). Jacky's father got it free from his vendor.</p> <p>We start. I call the kids to the stage.</p>
---	---

OF- This group is comfortable offering insights and taking my questions seriously. There is no backlash from peers.

OF- I ran into Mo, a 6 foot-plus thin black kid (Real name Mohammed), Somalian, I think, near the end of the school year. I greeted him by name

Ask Fernando and Joann, who are planning to take a sick day, to join us for the beginning. They do. I explain the project. I asked them why they thought I was taking notes about them. Answers: Bonnie: "We're lab mice." I laughed and told her that, as it turns out, they're humans. Silvia: "To get to know us better." "To see if you can work with us." Armando: "We're guinea pigs."

Key points I made differently this time:

Process drama uses all the skills they use in regular drama class, tableau, scenes, improv, but it's more like they have a storyline. I don't tell them that I need to take notes for validity, which I did tell the other group. I explain what's involved more concisely and tell them that after the first process drama, I'll let them vote on whether or not they want to continue.

I told them that I like working with urban kids better—no reaction.

I told them that I thought kids needed to know more about power and how to use it, so they could get more power. Several heads turned toward me and nodded thoughtfully, including Silvia and Jacky. Others looked a bit surprised.

I use the bird analogy. They imagine hummingbird, pterodactyl, phoenix (Karen), eagle, crow, ostrich, etc. They seem to get the analogy.

In response to the question about what power means:

Silvia: Control.

Fernando: I'll kill you if you don't do what I want. (I acknowledge that type of power.)

Mo: Respect.

(I ask him to explain how they're connected. He looks surprised, says,

and he seemed quite pleased to see me.

"Forget it." Armando says, "He's just throwing out words.") I ask the rest of class for clarification. Fernando: "Maybe people respect you if you have power." I agree with him. Someone says, "People want to be like you if you have power." I ask why. Jacky answers, "So maybe they can get more power, too." I say, "So if you're like someone who has power, you could get more powerful?" Heads nod, a few 'yesses'. Armando says something about how it's better to have power than be powerless.

I ask what else they think of when I say power. Mo says, "Girls." This bridges into a conversation about who has more power- males or females. All agree it's males. Erica (I think) says, "Males have more power because more people listen to them." She talks about the role of men across history, and their power. I ask if there's anyplace that women have more power. Jacky says, "In the home." There are rueful nods and grimaces. I ask, "Anywhere else?" Noemi says, "In offices." I ask why. She says, "Where women are in charge." I agree that, even if the woman isn't the boss, women often run offices.

OF- In re-reading this, I think their answers are more sophisticated and demonstrate a broader understanding of the wider world, societal trends, etc.

NOTE: Amy hears their answers as more insightful, more cogent than D block's. I'm not sure I agree. She ascribes a greater level of skill/knowledge to them. Because they more quickly and easily demonstrate the sense of community which is hugely important to her? I don't know.

I explain that Amy will be lead teaching F block so I can take better notes than in D block. I'll be facilitating with scenes and tableaux. I say that I'll be doing a warm-up with them so they get used to the sound of my voice. I make a joke about how deep it is, and compare it to a pile-driver. Some of them laugh with me. I tell them I have a lower voice

<p>Because they work together more easily?</p> <p>OF- Stephanie has less English than the others, and is not socially networked in the class. Even after Karen reaches out to her in a later class, she remains isolated, separate. Why? I don't know.</p> <p>Confident in their opinion so they don't have to soft peddle it? Or simpler in orientation? Or just a coincidence? Or responding to the need for unity in the group?</p>	<p>than my 22 year old son. They laugh harder, but with me, I think, not at me.</p> <p>I tell Fernando and Joanne that now is the time if they plan to take a sick day. They almost stay, but go at the last minute. Noemi sits out also. They watch actively throughout, however.</p> <p>In the walk, turn freeze- they take a long time to freeze effectively. Karen, Mo, and Armando especially. Francisco freezes seamlessly. No abrupt stop, just suddenly not moving. Same mini-rebellion as in D block after a few minutes- Armando and Mo talking to each other. Quickly quelled.</p> <p>In the sociograms- They are vigorous from the start—grabbing people, pulling them into group. They don't have the initial first scurry to be with friends, incorrectly assuming I'm creating work groups.</p> <p>Luis is the cool one- joining last, calling people over to him instead of moving to them. Stephanie wanders like a lost soul. Luis bumps someone out of a group. I let him do it once, but make him a leftover the next time, when he tries to bump Bonnie.</p> <p>Armando and Mo stand back.</p> <p>They have only 2 groups for both cats and broccoli- I love it, I hate it. There were more gradations in D block.</p> <p>At the end I thank them for participating.</p> <p>They ask to do an energy circle. I participate. Some bigger actions are in there than the last time I saw them do it. Armando does a rapper move, to see a. if I can do it and b. how accurately, I think. They are definitely watching me.</p> <p>So. On we go.</p>
--	---

10/21/08 F Block 8:58-9:49 Amy teaching
Introduction- Martin Drama

Cooked	Raw
<p>Lawson and Jeffrey never participate in the class, in spite of repeated invitations from Amy, and Joe coming in to encourage them. The kids dismiss them, saying, "They don't matter." Because they rejected this strong community? I don't know.</p>	<p>Francisco had a counseling appointment, Deedee, Erica, and Stephanie took sick days. Lawson sat out, but was watching. Jeffrey was absent.</p>
	<p>Hands game as warm up. Kids were giggling, struggling...</p>
	<p>FUQ: What is good in your life about doing things the same as other people? What's the benefit of not doing things the same as others?</p>
	<p>Answers: Same: role models Learn from others Develop expertise Jacky: Learn from their mistakes</p>
<p>As it turns out this is typical Armando—he is confident, mature and has a lot of status—very much "himself" I later found out that he works a regular job and belongs to a union. OF</p>	<p>Not the Same: Armando: be "different" therefore stay yourself</p>
	<p>FUQ What can make it hard to do things differently?</p>
<p>Also typical Fernando. Very bright, bit of a wise guy, and often goes his own way in thoughts and actions. Seems to feel deeply- actions don't always show this. OF</p>	<p>Fernando: Your way may be harder, more complicated.</p>
	<p>Amy: (laying pictures in a circle on the stage) I'm going to put the pictures on the ground. Look at the one near you...</p>
<p>This group was less affective than D block in their descriptions of why the baby shooting up was the most disturbing. More cognitive, ethical, less about abandonment, betrayal, caretaking. OF</p>	<p>Students found baby picture most disturbing. A close second was Martin on the ledge.</p>
	<p>Amy: What do you think this means? (referring to ages on pictures)</p>

Unusually “out there” for Bonnie, who is socially “cool” and somewhat less likely to show her smarts this way. OF

Also typical Luis. He has high status in the group—is very smart and thoughtful, but it’s not always shared. It’s as though it bursts out of him, he can’t help it. OF

OF- The scenes are less sophisticated than in D block. Better performed but less edgy and unusual in theme.

OF- These scenes have a cautionary take on negative community. These events result in Martin’s suicide

Bonnie: “Something in their past has affected their future.”

Luis: (in discussing picture of Martin) “I think that’s the craziest one.”

Amy: Why?

Luis: “Because it’s crazy to be that young and think about ending it.”

Amy: “What would put him out there?”

Answers: Family, drugs

Bonnie: “Life doesn’t seem fair to him.”

Amy: “We’re going to explore what put him out there.”

Amy groups them:

Luis, Fernando, Joanne, Noemi- Family

Adolfo, Francisco, Karen, A’lisa- Friends

Silvia, Jacky, Bonnie, Carlos- School

Tamar, Joselin, Armando- World

Tracy, Heba, Mo, Estefania- Community

Family scene: Father beating little sister. Martin covering his eyes in horror.

2nd: Father and Mother in physical fight, Martin smoking dope, sister trying to stop him.

Friends scene: Martin (Francisco) bullied, robbed.

2nd: Martin pressured to smoke dope by all 3- looks nervous

School scene: 3 girls giving Martin a “swirly”

2nd: Martin getting revenge on the ones who picked on him. - holding them

<p>attempt.</p> <p>Many of these scenes reflected the theme of revenge and kids going to the bad.</p> <p>I think it's possibly because those themes are heard regularly in the school. Stay on the right path, and don't join gangs—that sort of thing. OF</p> <p>Much stronger presence of drugs in these scenes than in D block (seen to represent escape, temptation, potential for the destruction of self)</p> <p>Their maturity, social sophistication, and lived experience are apparent in the depth of their answers here. Only Pauline in D block could imagine a way in which taking your own life might be the only power you have. OF</p> <p>Kick ass comment from Bonnie. OF</p> <p>There was less discussion with F block than D block. I think that's in part because Amy is not a big "discusser". She signals her desire to move on quickly when she asks a question. So when she does ask something, they answer briefly then look at her expectantly for the next task.</p>	<p>hostage.</p> <p>Amy: "What's going on?"</p> <p>Luis: "Witnessing violence."</p> <p>Community scenes: Martin (Tracy) watches out the window as someone is robbed and stabbed.</p> <p>2nd: pressured to do drugs. Martin (Tracy) unsure.</p> <p>World: two girls reject Martin for being black. (racism)</p> <p>2nd: Martin picking Tamar's pocket.</p> <p>Amy asks if Martin's apparent suicide attempt in the photo is a powerful act or a powerless act.</p> <p>Karen: "He doesn't have any power against himself."</p> <p>Silvia: "...no strength to live."</p> <p>Armando: "The world has the power over him."</p> <p>Luis: Powerful "Because he can decide whether to live or die."</p> <p>Tamar: "Because he has the right to make the biggest decision."</p> <p>Bonnie: "By the time he got to the edge, he didn't have any power anymore."</p> <p>Amy asked about the nature of the power the scenes reflected. What was the nature of power in the family? witnessing violence/abuse</p> <p>in the friends' scenes? The power to choose whether to do what's wrong</p> <p>in school? Revenge as power</p> <p>in the community? The power to resist drugs</p>
---	---

Request for Your Child's Participation in a Course-related Study

Your child is invited to be in a research study about how students see the effects of power dynamics in their lives. I am asking that your child take part because s/he is a student in Amy Czarnowski's Drama 2 class, and Ms. Czarnowski has given me permission to conduct research in her classroom as part of the requirements for a course I am taking at Harvard Extension School in Applied Research Methods. Please read this form and indicate whether or not you give permission for your child to participate in this research.

Purpose of the research

The purpose of this study is to see how theatre can be used to help students think about power dynamics that impact their lives. The study is part of my coursework requirements for a research methods course (Harvard Extension School SSCI E-104). The study will help me learn how to conduct interviews and observations, analyze data, and write up results. The area of this study, theatre and urban education, is of special interest to me.

What your child may be asked to do as part of this research

If you agree to have your child in this study, your child will take part in a regular Drama 2 class that uses theatre games and improvisation to explore different types of power in students' lives. There will be a follow-up interview with several of the students to discuss what they did in class and ask them to talk more about their ideas of power and power dynamics in their lives.

Time required

Your child will participate in their regularly scheduled Drama 2 class, and may be asked to interview for 30-45 minutes during a free period.

Risks

There are no anticipated risks associated with participating in this study.

Benefits

There are no direct benefits to your child's participation in this study. At the end of my data collection, your child's teacher will receive a brief memo describing my research and summarizing my initial findings.

Confidentiality

Your child's participation in this study will remain confidential, and his or her identity will not be stored with any data that I collect. I will protect your child's identity and that of other participants by assigning pseudonyms. Some data and formative writings about this research will be shared with other students in my Extension School course and the course instructors, and I may include this data as part of a scholarly article. While I will quote directly from interviews, documents, and observations, I will use only the assigned pseudonyms in all parts of my

analysis and/or in discussions with my fellow students in this course and my instructors. Real names will not be used in any of these conversations and the students and instructors understand the importance of maintaining confidentiality in discussing research data. I will not use the information you share with me for any purpose other than in relation to my work in the Applied Research Methods course at the Harvard Extension School and a scholarly article without your knowledge and permission.

All research-related material will be stored at my home and will not be accessible to others. The list connecting your name with your pseudonym will be kept separately and will be destroyed once all the data have been collected and analyzed.

Participation and withdrawal

Your child's participation in this study is completely voluntary, and you may withdraw your consent at any time without penalty. You may withdraw your child from this study or your child may withdraw on his or her own by informing me (no questions will be asked).

Contact

If you have questions about this research, please contact me, Bethany Nelson, at 9 Oak Drive, Topsfield, MA 01983. You can call me at (978) 766-6050, or email me at Bethany_nelson@emerson.edu. You may also contact the Harvard Extension School faculty supervising this work: Dr. David Eddy Spicer, 617-384-9869, eddyspda@gse.harvard.edu.

Whom to contact about your rights in this research

There is a Standing Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research at Harvard University to which complaints or problems concerning any research project may, and should, be reported if they arise. Committee telephone: 617-495-5459. Email: jcalhoun@fas.harvard.edu.

Agreement

The nature and purpose of this research have been satisfactorily explained to me and I agree to allow my child to take part in the study as described above. I understand that I am free to discontinue participation at any time if I so choose, and that the investigator will gladly answer any questions that arise during the course of the research.

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Name (print): _____

I have the authority to grant the foregoing consent for my child:

Child's name (print): _____

Interview Guide

Questions added after the first interview are in italics.

Research Questions: How do urban students of color understand the effect of power dynamics on their lives?

What meanings do these words hold for them?

Are they articulating the same level of knowledge verbally as they do in performance?

1) What do you remember about the drama class I watched? What stands out in your mind?

2) Question related to the power dynamics they showed/discussed in class

3) For you, what is power? How would *you* define power dynamics?

4) How can you tell when someone has power? What does that look like?

Example?

5) How can you tell when someone doesn't have power? What does that look like? *Example?*

6) Where in your life do you see/experience power dynamics?

In your life, when is someone having power a bad thing?

A good thing?

7) At school, where do you see power dynamics happening?

Who has power in school? Who doesn't?

How does that affect your school life? Or What difference does that make in your school life? *Example?*

8) At home, where do you see power dynamics happening?

Who has power at home? Who doesn't?

How does that affect your home life? Or What difference does that make in your home life? *Example?*

9) Do you have a job? At your job, where do you see power dynamics happening?

Who has power at your job? Who doesn't?

How does that affect your work life? Or What difference does that make in your work life? *Example?*

10) In the world, where do you see power dynamics happening?

What makes someone powerful in the world? Powerless? *Example?*

11) In any of these situations, what's the worst abuse of power you've seen or heard of? What's the most positive use of power you've seen or heard of?

12) Which are more typical/frequent: violent or non-violent demonstrations of power?

13) When in your life do you feel the most powerful? The least powerful?

14) Can you get more power? If yes, how? If no, what makes that impossible?

(In different situations already discussed)

15) If you could choose, where in your life would you like to have more power? Imagine that you have more power in that area. How do you imagine that would feel?

How would that change things for you?

16) *Why did you choose to take this class? What about this class makes you feel powerful or powerless? Why?*

17) *This class is a tight-knit group. Why do you think that is?*

18) Is there anything you'd like to add? Is there anything you want to ask me?

Post-Project Survey

NAME _____

Please circle the answer that best reflects your feeling about each statement.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Could go either way	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I am a powerful person.	1	2	3	4	5
Anyone can succeed in this country.	1	2	3	4	5
Money makes you powerful.	1	2	3	4	5
I feel most powerful when I am competing with others.	1	2	3	4	5
When I go after something I want, I usually get it.	1	2	3	4	5
I can influence the behavior and ideas of others.	1	2	3	4	5
I feel powerful at home.	1	2	3	4	5
Anyone can make change in the world if they try.	1	2	3	4	5
I think this country is working fine the way it is.	1	2	3	4	5
I trust adults to know what they're doing.	1	2	3	4	5
I like feeling powerful.	1	2	3	4	5
Money is the most important tool for gaining power.	1	2	3	4	5
I feel powerful at school.	1	2	3	4	5
Power can be achieved	1	2	3	4	5

through effort.

Most people with power are born with it.	1	2	3	4	5
It is possible to change who has the power.	1	2	3	4	5
You must have money to have power.	1	2	3	4	5
People have more power when they work together.	1	2	3	4	5
People have more power when they work alone.	1	2	3	4	5
I feel powerful in this class.	1	2	3	4	5

Name anything new you understand about power after this project.

Individual interview

1) What will stick in your mind from this experience? Why?

2) Name one thing you think you've learned from this experience.

Open question

About the world

About power

3) Is there anything you know now that you didn't know before that:

you're glad you know?

You kind of wish you didn't know?

4) Why do you think people protest/picket/do collective action?

5) Somebody wrote: This is a life-changing show. What do you think they meant by that? What were they referring to?

Preliminary Study- Lesson Plan

1) WARM UP:

Blind Car Exercise – Divide into pairs. One person stands in front of the other and closes his/her eyes. He/She is the ‘blind car’. The person behind is the ‘driver’ who gives directions by touching the ‘car’s’ back with his/her hand.

Left Shoulder = turn left

Right Shoulder = turn right

Press center of back = go straight (pressure indicates speed)

NO touch = stop

Follow Up Questions:

1. Who steers you?
2. Tells you where to go?
3. Asks you to go where they say without question?
4. Who do you trust enough to let steer you?

2) BODY OF LESSON:

First Exercise – In small groups create a tableau of “Who has the power in the picture”? Give suggestions for images – family, school, work, world etc...Ask observers to determine the ‘power holder’. Share.

Second Exercise – Scene work in small groups with one person with power telling you what to do. Show the moment of telling. 2-3 lines total. Can choose from tableaux or create new scenarios.

Expand into power struggle. Add more lines to scenes, or show in pantomime – different areas as well.

Third Exercise – In small groups tell a story of a moment when someone took power over you. Improv the argument or moment when that occurred. Allow others to step in and add/continue the argument (Forum theater style).

Process Drama 1- Introducing the Form

Day 1

- 1) Sociograms—in groups of 3, 4, 5, etc. (leftovers rule—no one is a leftover more than once in a row)
- 2) Sociograms by height, shoes, hair, family size, broccoli, cats
- 3) Put 5 pictures in a circle on the ground. About 4 students around each photo.

Rotate to next photo until everyone has seen all of the photos.

Ask for their first impressions.

Which photo do they find most disturbing, and why?

What do they think the photos mean?

What sense do they make of the ages of the children in the photos?

Explain that the photos are advertisements by Barnardos, a Canadian orphanage.

They are looking for donations and adoptive parents. Today, we are going to work with this photo (Martin Ward, a 6 or 7 year old black child about to jump off a high rise balcony.)

Ask what they notice about the picture. What would put this child/man out on this ledge?

Ask if they think this act seems like a powerful or powerless act to them.

Tell them that it looks like there's an invisible hand in the middle of his back, pushing him forward. Tell them that we'll be exploring what that 'hand' or those 'hands' might be.

- 4) Reiterate that we're beginning our exploration of power. In 4 small groups, each of which is responsible for one area of Martin's life (family, friends, school, and in his community) have students create 2 tableaux—one which shows Martin

at the age he is in the photo—6 or 7, and one which shows him at 17 or 18, right before he leaves high school. The goal of the tableaux are to help us understand how Martin ended up on that ledge at age 29. What was going on with his family, friends, etc. that made him feel so powerless that he felt suicide was his best, or maybe his only, alternative? Have them practice the change between tableaux and use their own lights out, lights on convention.

Day 2

1) Warm-up- Think of anything you remember from yesterday. Mill and seethe-freeze- say it. Mill and seethe as character you were in the tableau.

2) Return to tableaux. Share and discuss.

What did you notice?

What changed from 7-17?

Who is taking Martin's power in this moment?

3) Create scenes for each tableau. Each group has 1 line per student in the group, though they can be divided up among the actors any way they choose. Make sure there's at least one line in there that helps us understand why he ends up on that ledge. (Ask for examples.) Share and discuss.

What do we know now that we didn't know before?

What moment or sentence from this scene will Martin remember? What moment might be running through his head as he stands on that balcony?

4) If it seems fruitful, choose a strong scene, freeze it in several places, and have the students speak the inner thoughts of Martin or his persecutors. (Optional for time)

Why do you think people enact their power in that way?

5) Have students imagine what might have happened to Martin in the year of his decision (28-29) that might have pushed him to climb up on that ledge. Ask what things are part of your life by age 29 that usually aren't at 17 (job, family, car, criminal record, etc.) Ask them to name a 'disappointment' Martin could have faced in each area. Have each student write one phrase (e.g. "You're fired!") that Martin might have heard in the last year. Stand in a circle around the photo of Martin and speak those lines, students deciding when/where their line fits in the sociopoem.

6) Tell the students: If you look closely at the photo, you'll see that Martin is really past the point of balance in this image. It's as though there's a hand in the middle of his back, holding onto his shirt. What is that hand? What is it that's keeping him from jumping? In your own life, if you were perched on the edge that way, what would that hand be that would hold you back?

7) Follow-Up questions:

We created Martin's powerless life here. Why do you think it's such a big deal to have power or not have power in your life?

What might Martin have done in his adult life to reclaim his power?

Process Drama 2—The Ludlow Massacre

Goals: The students will identify aspects of power reflected in the labor struggles of the coal miners that reflect the power reflected in their lives (partially as demonstrated in Martin scenes).

The students will identify the connection between power and money, and powerlessness and immigrant status at that time.

The students will identify collective action as a source of power for the miners.

1) Warm-Up about power- Hands game.

It can be hard to do something together. Why?

Speed Images of the richest and the poorest people in the world. Tell students to think extreme- *impossibly* rich and *impossibly* poor. Ask for an example in each category and very quickly build it. Grab people, create the image, we guess whether it's a "rich" picture or a "poor" one.

2) Lay out pictures of Mother Jones, John Rockefeller, Miners, Karl Linderfelt with quotes about each:

Who do you think has the most power? Why?

Who do you think has the least power? Why?

3) Put Rockefeller and Miner pictures side by side. We want to compare their lives, his wealth and their poverty, but we're looking for realism this time.

Create the lives of each, using images and facts.

Miners:

The miners worked 10 hours a day, six days a week.

The miners earned \$1.68 per day.

The miner's huts, usually shared by several families, were made of clapboard and thin-planked floors, with leaking roofs, sagging doors, broken windows, and layers of old newspaper nailed to the wall to keep out the cold.

Boys went to work in the mines at age 13.

In the early dawn, cages carried the men down into the blackness of the mine. There was usually a main tunnel, with dozens of "rooms" held up

by timbers, where the miners hacked away at the face of the coal seam with hand picks.

The average coal seam was three feet high. The miners would often work on their knees or on their sides, never able to straighten up.

Only a few mining families were American. The rest were Greeks, Montenegrins, Bulgars, Serbians, Italians, Mexicans, Tyroleans, Croatians, Austrians, Savoyards, and others from the Southern countries of Europe. Twenty-two different languages were spoken in the colony.

There were two main causes for mine disasters—rotten timbers holding up the roofs of the mines collapsed, and the build-up of gas and dust caused explosions in the mines.

Rockefeller:

In 1914, the Rockefeller fortune was over \$100,000,000,000.

The Rockefeller estate is a 40 room mansion that has been home to four generations of Rockefellers. Filled with valuable art, it is six stories high and has many interconnecting underground passages and service delivery tunnels.

John D. Rockefeller Jr. had 6 children. All went to excellent schools and became successful business people, art collectors, and politicians.

John D. Rockefeller Jr. was put in charge of the Colorado Fuel and Iron Company by his father, John D. Rockefeller Sr. He ran it from his office in New York City, in the Rockefeller Building.

Rockefeller told investigators that he had not visited Colorado for 10 years. He said he had not the “slightest idea” of wages or conditions in the mine.

There were two main causes for mine disasters—rotten timbers holding up the roofs of the mines collapsed, and the build-up of gas and dust caused explosions in the mines.

Rockefeller felt the mining company should hire immigrants and black people, because they could be paid less than Englishmen.

4) In 6 groups- create the lives of each- movement only, no words

Rockefeller- At home, at work, his children

Miners- At home, at work, children at work

“Your job is to communicate your half of this story for the other half of the group, so we all end up understanding how things were. Choose one quote/fact to read aloud during your performance. Choose the one which you feel it is most important that the other side hear.”

Day 2

1) Warm-up: Energy circle- Miner movement or Rockefeller movement- whichever group they're in.

2) Finish creating scenes from Day 1. Share and discuss.

What would these miners think if they could see how Rockefeller lives?

What would Rockefeller think if he could see how these miners live?

Given what you see here, why do you think there might be conflict between rich people and poor people?

3) Lay the Rockefeller pictures (Rockefeller Jr, with his father, and the mansion) next to the Miner pictures (miners in the seam, miners in the “hall”, group of miners). Put three or four pictures of the Ludlow Massacre between them. The

conflict in their interests resulted in the murder of 11 children and two adults, as well as 53 other miners.

What could possibly have happened to cause this?

What might Rockefeller have wanted from these miners that could have generated enough conflict to result in their deaths?

What could the miners have wanted from Rockefeller?

What possible reason could this rich guy have to fight with these poor guys? To the death?

Take a few guesses.

4) Tell the students that first we'll take a minute to understand how these miners got to this point. Have them sit in a half-circle with their eyes closed. Tell them we'll be doing a visualization. Ask them to imagine the following: You decided to come to America for a better life and for a better future for your children. In your countries, there are no good jobs, no money, not enough food to go around. Imagine the house you live in. Look around it. What do you notice? (Take a few suggestions.) Stand in the doorway of your house looking outside. What do you notice? (Take a few suggestions.) What will you miss about your homeland? (Take a few suggestions.) Tell them they've sold their belongings, and have taken a boat to get to America with little more than the clothes on their backs. You will have to work hard and buy new things in America. Ask them to name the one thing they brought with them besides clothes and food. (Take a few suggestions.) Once in the states, you heard about good mining jobs in the west, so you took the last of your money and got your family on a train to Colorado. Imagine the beauty out of the windows of the train—wild country, majestic mountains. Imagine that you are stepping out of the train in Trinidad, Colorado. It's cold

because it's in the mountains, and there's snow on the ground already. If you are from Greece or Italy, the cold must be a big surprise to you. More surprising is the sudden ugliness of the mining camp. Thick clouds of soot from burning coal hang in the air and pile on the ground, choking out any grass that tries to grow. The miners' huts are crowded close together and are in poor repair. The stream behind the camp is a yellow trickle. What feelings do you think you might be having? (Take a few suggestions.)

Day 3

1) Ask the students to remind you of what they saw when they got off the train at Trinidad. Put the pictures of the mining town in the circle. Ask them to remind you of their feelings at the time. Most of these people took jobs at the mine.

Why? (Take a few suggestions.)

2) Go into a semi-role as a recruiter for the mine. Have the students sit in a line across the back wall. Tell the students to move forward when they hear something that makes them feel better about taking the job. (Congratulate each person for the wisdom of their decision as they make it.)

Identify the following benefits of working for Colorado Fuel & Iron Company:

At CF&I, we'll provide you with housing. You don't even have to pay us the rent money up front for the first month—we just take it out of your paycheck as you go along. You can move right in.

We provide a school for your children—free of charge.

We have a store right in camp that supplies everything you could need.

Need a mattress? Cook pots? Shoes? Food? We have it all. And don't have any cash on hand? No problem—we'll let you buy it on credit.

A man who works hard can bring in \$20/week. That's more than you could earn laying track for the railroad, and it's a safer job, too.

There's a new law that allows *you* to elect your own checker for weighing the coal you mine, so you can be sure we're paying you fairly.

And we hire our own police force, so this camp is safe from theft and other crimes.

- 3) For those who have moved forward, ask why. For those who haven't, ask why.

What didn't the recruiter tell you that you already know is a problem?

(Size of houses, houses were wrecks, 3-4 families per house, lots of mine accidents)

If people were unhappy, why didn't they just leave? (In discussing this, make sure to address the company store/company housing problem. The miners owed the company money from day one. If they left owing money, they could be arrested.)

- 4) Have students create tableaux in pairs- what was the miners' greatest hope from this job? Their greatest fear? Have half the group do greatest hope, half greatest fear. Show half at a time as a Ludlow Museum, with the fear group commenting on what they see in the hope tableaux and vice versa.

- 5) Narrate the issues that came up for the miners, including:

pay issues (they only made 10.08/wk and weren't paid for non-mining work like digging tunnels and propping up the ceilings.)

the company store charged 25-40% more than anywhere else, but miners weren't allowed to buy stuff anywhere else, because they were paid in script (fake money that was only worth 90 cents on the dollar.)

They were constantly cheated by the weight checker, 400-800 pounds/ton.

If they complained, the police beat them up.

Death statistics: In 1907, an explosion in a mine killed 24 men.

In 1910, another explosion killed 79. A mine official said, "Such accidents will happen, and we must make the best of it... Work will be resumed as soon as the miners get over the excitement."

In 1910, at the Starkville mine, an explosion killed 40 miners. Rescuers were kept out of the mine during daylight hours so as not to cause panic.

Four weeks later, another mine exploded, killing 82.

Day 4

1) The miners decided to go on strike. Ask the students to tell you anything they know about striking. Fill in any holes. Ask them to remind you what some of the issues were for the miners. Fill in any holes. In this case, the miners had to move out of their houses, because they were owned by CF&I. The United Mine Workers Union rented land outside of town, and bought 400 tents. 1200 miners and their wives and children moved into these tents, and lived there, through the winter, for 14 months. Show them the picture of the Tent Colony. Tell them that in the first December, it snowed 42 inches.

2) The miners wanted to avoid violence, at first, so the state wouldn't call in the National Guard. But the mine operators wanted the Guard to come in and break up the strike. The mine operators committed acts of violence against the strikers,

and soon the strikers responded with violence of their own. Tell the students that they're going to explore the violence that escalated on both sides. Talk about the challenge of presenting violence effectively on stage. In life, it is often very quick, but on stage you need to slow it down, let the audience catch up with what they're seeing. This violence ultimately ended up killing many people, so we're going to give it the impact on stage that it had in people's real lives. The scenes will move at regular speed until the violent moment is reached. Then it will move into slow motion—not so slow that it's comical, but slow enough to have dramatic impact.

3) Hand out strips with incidents on them. Help students choreograph violent pieces.

Striker Violence:

A group of Greek strikers were sabotaging a company-built footbridge. Bob Lee, the chief guard of the plant rode up on horseback. He drew his sword to slash at the strikers when one of them shot him in the throat with a pistol, killing him instantly.

The miners were enraged at strikebreakers (called 'scabs') who were hired to do their jobs. One day, four mine guards were killed escorting a scab safely into the mine. The scab was viciously beaten by the miners.

Guard leader George Belcher was leaving a Trinidad drugstore, the town square full of soldiers and guards. He stopped on the corner to light a cigar. As he struck a match, a bullet from an unseen rifle entered his brain, killing him instantly. The gunman was never caught.

Mine Owner Violence:

The Baldwin Felts Detective Agency built a special auto with a Gatling Gun mounted on it, and armored sides. They called it the Death Special. The Death Special drove up to the tent colony and opened fire, killing one man and wounding two. A ten-year-old boy was left with 9 bullets in his leg.

Mrs. Yankinski, a miner's wife, was at home with her children when militiamen broke in and stole her money. Before they left, one kicked her little girl in the face, breaking her nose.

The women at Ludlow held a rally in support of Mother Jones. Guardsmen attacked the women, slashing them with swords and kicking them as they fell.

4) Share, showing owner violence then striker violence by turns, and discuss.

How did the violence get to that point?

Who do you think was more at fault?

Who do you feel was more powerful?

Why do you think no one said, "Okay, stop it. This is enough. We've gone too far here"?

Day 5

1) Warm-up: You, You, You intercut with Bang! Bang! Bang!

2) Have students choose whether they'll explore the climax of this situation as strikers or militia. Give pictures of machine gun nests to students as militia. Have

them set up two positions as true to the image as possible. Give strikers images of the tent colony. Have them decide where in that life they'll place themselves.

3) Tell the militia that they are waiting for the order to fire. They know that the car, the Death Special, killed a child the first time it was used. A quarter of the people in the camps are children. What are they thinking about? Tell the strikers that they know the machine guns are aimed at them, ready. The fabric of the tents affords no protection. Their children are with them. What are their thoughts? Move among the images. When their shoulder is touched, they should speak the inner thoughts of their character.

4) Amy will take the role as Linderfelt. I'll be in role as Mother Jones. Amy will speak first, primarily to the strikers. Linderfelt will say that the strikers need to break the strike, NOW. If not, he cannot be held responsible for what might happen. The violence they've already been forced to in response to the strikers' destruction of private property and attacks on innocent workers will look tame compared to what they're prepared to do to end this chaos and lawlessness. They're immigrants—what other jobs do they think they'll be able to get? How will they live with the guilt of sacrificing their own children for their selfishness and greed?

Mother Jones will encourage the strikers not to lose heart. They've come this far, and the company is clearly desperate to resort to this. They've put millions of dollars into Rockefeller's pocket through their labor, and they have NOTHING to show for it. When she sees the mangled hands of the child workers, hears the hacking death cough of miners sick with black lung, she is shocked at the heartlessness and greed of the rich. Would they ask you to sacrifice your children, and your children's children, in that black hole of death in the ground?

They must stand together and stand strong! And, she'll tell the militia, you're doing the devil's work. How will you live with yourselves? How will you look into the faces of your children, of your own mother, and say, "I shot starving children." Refuse to carry out this despicable mission!

Ask what their thoughts are. Do they think the strikers should step down? Should the militia refuse to fire? If they say yes to either or both, point out that events proceeded anyway. Why do they think no one stepped forward and said, "I won't." Does anyone wanted to change sides?

5) Students will return to their positions. Amy, as Linderfelt, will call "Fire!" I will call Bang! 6 or 7 times. As I do, both the strikers and the soldiers should move in slow motion. What will those in the camp do? The gunners?

If time permits, have militia members set the tents on fire. Narrate this action as it occurs. Have one second of reaction from both militia and strikers. Freeze. Put the photos of the burned out camp on the floor.

Name any feelings you had during this event.

Why did this happen?

Was collective action a positive or a negative in this case?

The Strike failed to result in an 8 hour day, but other changes happened over time as a result of these events. What do you think the sacrifices of these people had to do with those changes? Was it worth it?

Process Drama 3- Power in The Students' Lives

Goals: The students will explore situations in their own lives in which someone else has power over them.

They will explore possible solutions to those problems which do not include violence.

1) *Blind Car Exercise* – Divide into pairs. One person stands in front of the other and closes his/her eyes. (blind-folded?) He/She is the ‘blind car’. The person behind is the ‘driver’ who gives directions by touching the ‘car’s’ back with his/her hand.

Left Shoulder = turn left

Right Shoulder = turn right

Press center of back = go straight (pressure indicates speed)

NO touch = stop

Follow Up Questions:

Who steers you?

Tells you where to go?

Asks you to go where they say without question?

Who do you trust enough to let steer you?

Who tries to steer you but you don’t want them to?

2) What types of power did people have in the Ludlow situation? (Power of guns/violence, of the group, persuasion, coercion, money, need, the law, etc. If necessary, ask them to name the power of the militia, of Mother Jones, of Linderfelt, of the strikers, of the children, of Rockefeller to get these ideas on the table.) Brainstorm a few situations in which someone has any of those types of power over you.

Ask them to think about where and how that power is enacted. We rarely have men with pickaxes blowing up bridges or old ladies tottering into battles at coal

mines, but power is still everywhere. Where is power enacted on them, and what do those forms of power look like nowadays?

3) Have students take their places on a power continuum, from very powerful to not powerful at all. Ask several students to share why they chose the position they did. Have students count off by fives, so there are a range of power orientations in each group.

4) In small groups, create a situation in which someone has one of those types of power over a young person. (Give them out- money, violence, group, persuasion, the law, or choose the places if they are struggling with the idea of types of power —home, school, work, friends, the world.)

5) Create a 4 line scene demonstrating power in these dynamics. Share and discuss.

Who has the power in this scene?

What type of power is this?

6) Find a way to take back the power in this scene. No violence and no leaving the situation. If you were going to try to take it back, how would you do it? Show and discuss.

How did they flip the power dynamic?

Think of a time when you've reclaimed power in your own life. How did you do it? How did it feel to do it?

Process Drama 4- Contemporary Job Actions

1) Warm-up: Make a Whopper! Students count off by 5- top bun, meat, veggies, condiments, pickles. When the leader calls "Make a Whopper," they must assemble one as quickly as possible with all components, calling "Burger King!"

when finished. In a second round, secretly make two students cheese. They must assemble a cheese whopper to win the game.

2) Balanced Diet salad—(variation on Zen Fruit salad) Whoppers, Grapes, Chicken tenders.

3) Divide students into 3 groups of approximately 8 students each (by having them pull a 1, 2, or 3 out of a hat). The students then draw a new slip of paper which reads either Worker, On-Site Manager, or Owner (4-5 workers, 2 On-Site Managers, 1-2 owners per group). Briefly discuss what those different roles might mean in practical and socioeconomic terms (what they do for work and what they earn a year), using working at Market Basket and in the coal mines as examples.

4) Give each group a piece of text. Have one person read it aloud to the group. The text is a brief description of one of three industries: grape harvesting circa 1965, Burger King circa 2008, chicken processing circa 2008.

Tell the students that their job is to create a movement piece that shows the work tasks of their group in that industry. In their small groups, have them identify 3-5 components of their task (work actions). Write them down. These movement pieces must have the following elements which the students will receive on slips of paper:

- 1) They must be repetitive—the whole cycle must be performed at least 3 times through
- 2) All 3-5 job components must be represented in movement
- 3) They must face each other at least once, and face away from each other at least once during the piece
- 4) There must be at least one work-related injury for the worker group in the cycle.

- 5) At some point in the cycle, everyone in the small group must be doing the same thing at the same time.

Migrant Workers- Grape Pickers

Between 1965-1970, grape pickers in California went on strike to protest dangerous working conditions and low pay.

Grape pickers worked a 10-12 hour day working with a short hoe that caused them to work stooped over, moving up and down the rows of grape plants, chopping grapes from the vines. Worker injuries were common, with back and shoulder problems, cuts from the hoes, and pesticide poisoning most common. The rate of birth defects in the children of grape pickers, caused by constant exposure to pesticides which were sprayed on the fields by planes while the workers were present, was 6 times the national average.

Workers would arrive at a central location each morning, hoping to be chosen to work for the day. They would pile onto the back of a truck for the long ride to the vineyard, work for 12 hours in the hot sun, chopping grapes, placing them carefully in boxes, and hauling the boxes into the back of a truck. These pickers, mostly Mexican and Filipino, were paid much less than minimum wage—about \$1.25/hour. Often the owners provided no bathrooms and the only water available was the water used for the grape plants.

Workers were supervised by on-site managers, who were paid to make sure that the workers moved at a fast pace. They were often abusive and violent. They patrolled the rows of plants, pushing the workers to increase their speed and making sure they didn't damage the fruit. The wealthy owners of the vineyards rarely came to the fields.

Even today, farm workers often earn \$4-5/hr. and on-site managers earn about \$12.25/hr. Undocumented pickers earn much less.

Burger King Workers

The fast food industry is the site of more injuries to teen workers than any other workplace. Most injuries happen in hamburger places like Burger King. 53% of teen injuries occur at hamburger fast food restaurants.

These fast-food establishments hire a lot of teen workers, who can be paid less than adults doing the same job. Teens cook, working the broiler and fryers, clean, and run the cash register, among other jobs. The most common injuries are burns, sprains and broken limbs from slipping on greasy or wet floors, and shoulder, back and wrist injuries from repetitive tasks like pulling baskets out of the fryer or running the cash register.

Teens who work at Burger King are paid \$6.75/hr on average. On-site Managers average \$9.96/hr. They are paid to make sure the workers are doing their jobs, as well as scheduling work hours, ordering supplies, and dealing with customer complaints.

Burger Kings are franchise restaurants. Owners pay Burger King Corporation for the right to run a Burger King restaurant and take the profits from it.

Chicken Processing

The chicken processing industry is mostly found in the south, in North and South Carolina in particular. The workers are mainly black women, many of them single mothers. The chicken processing industry is one of the most dangerous and abusive in the United States today.

In the factory, dead, plucked chickens move by on a conveyor belt at the rate of 80 chickens per minute. Women sit or stand beside the belt, and each does her part of the processing job as the chickens move by. These jobs include pulling out the innards, cutting the chicken in half, snipping tumors and discolored spots from the skin with sharp scissors, and pulling the meat from the bone for boneless chicken products, like McNuggets and Chicken Tenders. The demand for chicken has increased in the past 10 years by 400%, so there is pressure on the factories to increase the speed of their work.

Workers do the exact same action for 8-10 hours/day. They are allowed one 5 minute bathroom break every 3 hours, and a 20 minute lunch break. Anyone complaining is fired. Stress injuries to hands, arms, and shoulders are the most common injuries, and are so severe that many women lose feeling in their hands and are permanently disabled. In the Perdue Chicken Plant, half of all workers report to the nurse before work each day to get pain killers, wraps for their hands, and heat or cold packs for their shoulders. Workers earn \$6-8/hr.

On-Site Managers earn \$10-15/hr. Their job is to keep the women working, at top speed. They scream at the workers for taking bathroom breaks and hurry them back from lunch. The chicken industry is run by 6 or 7 very large corporations owned by a handful of rich people. It is a multi-billion dollar industry.

Day 2

1) Warm-up: Aggressor/ protector

Hen and chicks

2) Perform with all three groups (Owner, On-Site Manager, and Worker) onstage together. Cue the music for the group. (Amazing Grace for the Chicken Workers, A Puerto Rican Mambo song for the Grape Pickers, Soft Rock for the Burger King workers)

Have performing groups freeze. Discuss.

What do you notice?

What is the nature of the work for the workers? For the On Site Managers? For the Owners?

If there was trouble, like there was in the coal mines, which side do you think the On Site Managers would choose? Why?

What is the downside of choosing to side with the workers? With the owners?

3) In same groups, have students create a scene entitled: Complaining About The Job.

The Managers and Owners are in scene with each other. The Workers are in their same groups. The scene must have a clear beginning, middle and end, and a climax. Somewhere in the scene they must use a movement from the movement piece. Show and discuss.

What were the nature of the workers' complaints? The On-Site managers' complaints? The Owners' complaints?

Do you think the workers' complaints are valid? The Managers' complaints? The Owners'?

Do you think the managers/owners know about the workers' problems?

Why do you think they don't try to fix them?

4) The Grape Pickers and the Chicken processors both struck for higher pay and safer working conditions, and they won. Why do you think the Burger King Workers don't strike? Should they? Why or why not? Explain that BK workers aren't unionized.

Day 3

- 1) Warm-up- Amoeba tag
- 2) Tell students that the jobs we've been looking at are jobs that are held mostly by immigrants, undocumented immigrants, and poor people. Have the students brainstorm the jobs that these groups often hold in their world/neighborhoods. (Fast food restaurants, custodial, maids and cleaning people, supermarkets, MBTA booths, etc.)
- 3) Divide the class into 5 groups. (Students choose their groups.) Read *La Causa* aloud to them.

La Causa : The Delano Grape Strike, 1965–1970

1. We are men and women
who have suffered and endured much
and not only because of our abject poverty
but because we have been kept poor.
2. The color of our skins,
the languages of our cultural and native origins,
the lack of formal education,
the exclusion from the democratic process,
3. the numbers of our slain in recent wars—
all these burdens generation after generation

have sought to demoralize us,

to break our human spirit.

4. But God knows we are not beasts of burden,

we are not agricultural implements

or rented slaves,

5. we are men.

— Cesar E. Chavez, 1969

an open letter to the grape industry

Ask them to name any feelings they heard in the piece. La Causa was written about the grape pickers' situation. Cesar Chavez saw the plight of these workers, and he wrote this to the grape owners. Ask them to imagine what image from the grape fields he might have been seeing in his head when he wrote the words, "We are men and women

who have suffered and endured much." Get 2-3 good ideas. Ask them to imagine the images he was remembering when he wrote, "the numbers of our slain in recent wars". Get 2-3 good ideas.

4) Have each group choose an industry from the basket (these industries will be identified by them in the earlier discussion, then written on pieces of paper). Give each group a section of the text. Their task is to create a short scene, a moment, with or without words, that might cause someone to write those lines about the industry their group is responsible for—for example, factory or custodial workers. Give a few examples, and take questions. We'll play the same music used for the Grape Pickers as the images perform. Their text must be read, either during the piece or after it.

5) Have all groups stand in a circle onstage. Perform without break, in order of the text.

What stands out for you about these performances?

What are the similarities and differences between these industries?

What might improve the situation?

Tell me anything you know about unions. (Briefly explain that unions come into industries and organize the workers. They are a tool for communication between work sites ‘This is what’s going on in this industry.’ They stand up for the rights of union workers, call in government agencies [like OSHA] to take care of some abuses, and provide legal support for their members.)

Why do you think managers/owners don’t like to see unions come in?

What are the risks that workers take when they join a union? What benefits do they get?

Imagine that you or your parents are in one of these jobs. What could make you stand up for your rights, in spite of the risks? What would you put your butt on the line for? Have each student answer.

Why I think this project worked the way it did:

I think you built your understanding of the nature of the world (racism, corruption, etc.) by listening to each other's stories/truths. What was my role in this?

I think you worked so hard on the show because you felt like you owed it to each other and the group, now that you know each other's stories.

I think that the question of 'giants' who change things seemed uninteresting or even impossible to you until you realized how much control you'd taken of your own lives, and heard others' stories about that, too. Then it seemed interesting and possible.

I think you experienced a level of community and trust in this class that is very different from what you experience in school as a whole.

I think the theatre project asked you to share parts of yourself that you usually wouldn't, and you did it partly because you want to be known by other people.

I think you experienced a sense of power when you got the script and when you performed it.

I think it felt powerful for you to share your ideas and lives to educate other people.

I think the images of protesters were powerful for you when we first did them because they are people like you and your family/community doing something big.

Is there anything that's missing?